

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

THURSDAY, April 9, 1998

New York Times

April 9, 1998

Pg. 1

U.S. Is Planning Move to Seize Pol Pot for Trial

By Philip Shenon
and Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton has ordered the Departments of Defense, State and Justice to devise plans for the arrest and trial of Pol Pot, the shadowy Khmer Rouge leader responsible for the death of perhaps a million Cambodians in the 1970s.

Clinton administration officials and Western diplomats said that the Khmer Rouge appeared to be near collapse as a result of mass defections and internal fighting. Pol Pot and other Khmer Rouge leaders are said to be in hiding in the Cambodian jungle only a few miles across the border with Thailand.

The Thai government, diplomats said, has suggested it would be willing to take Pol Pot into custody as long as the United States agreed to spirit him out of Thailand within hours of his capture.

Senior American military officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, said that intelligence reports from Southeast Asia showed that the Thai

military had actually taken Pol Pot into custody late last week but then freed him.

The Thai military, the officials said, may have feared that his capture would antagonize China, long an ally of the Khmer Rouge, and would complicate the foreign policy of Thailand's recently installed government, which is already struggling with an economic crisis.

Spokesmen at the Thai embassy in Washington had no comment. Other American officials described the intelligence reports as sketchy and said it would be unfair to criticize the Thai military on the basis of such fragmentary evidence.

While administration officials cautioned that there was no guarantee that the ailing Khmer Rouge leader would be apprehended, they said that recent developments along the border were so significant that Clinton issued a written order Monday to organize logistics for Pol Pot's capture and trial.

Under one plan being discussed within the administra-

tion, an American military plane would take Pol Pot from Thailand to a third country, possibly the Netherlands, where international tribunals are prosecuting war crimes carried out in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

A military official said the Pentagon had drawn up a list of interim sites where Pol Pot might be held until a location for the trial was selected. These include the Northern Marianas Islands and Wake Island -- both American territories in the Pacific -- or the American naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

"We've had many false alarms before with the Khmer Rouge, but this may be our best chance to get Pol Pot," said a Clinton administration official who is involved in the planning. "We're not going to be caught unprepared if he's made available to us."

Another American official said that "if we don't get Pol Pot this time, he may die before we ever have the chance to bring him to justice."

The official said that despite

the reports of Pol Pot's capture and release by Thai soldiers last week, the civilian-led Thai government "is being cooperative -- and their cooperation will be essential if we're to pull this off."

Under Clinton's order, officials said, the State Department has been directed to oversee negotiations with Thailand, the Netherlands and other nations that might be involved in the apprehension and trial. The Justice Department has been asked to review the legal authority that would be needed under international law for the United States to become involved in the detention of Pol Pot.

Western diplomats said prosecutors at the international tribunals in The Hague had already tentatively agreed to organize a trial for Pol Pot for crimes against humanity, as long as the U.N. Security Council empowers them to oversee the prosecution.

The diplomats said the United States, France and other nations had already begun

State Department seeks a 'major say' on weapons

Arms control agency's quest riles critics in Pentagon

Washington Times...See Pg. 2

Bosnian War Crimes Suspects Arrested

Washington Post...See Pg. 3

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS PROMISE QUICK ACTION ON FY-98 SUPPLEMENTAL

Inside The Pentagon...See Pg. 5



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



drafting a Security Council resolution to deal with such a trial.

From 1975 to 1979, Pol Pot, who is now in his 70s and in poor health, turned Cambodia into a vast labor camp. Millions of Cambodians, especially city-dwellers, were driven from their homes and forced to work in the fields under primitive conditions. Pol Pot labeled anyone with money or education an enemy of the revolu-

tion, and much of the middle class was killed during his four-year reign of terror or starved to death.

The Khmer Rouge were toppled by a Vietnamese invasion in 1979. They resumed their guerrilla struggle in the jungle, where they have remained for two decades. They have armed and fed themselves with the proceeds of the sale of gems and timber harvested in areas of Cambodia under their

control.

The movement began to fall apart last year, when the followers of Pol Pot turned against him, apparently over his decision to order the assassination of the Khmer Rouge defense chief, Son Sen, and 14 relatives, including his grandchildren.

After the killings, Pol Pot's former comrades tried him and sentenced him to house arrest. He is reported to be under the

control of his former top military commander, Ta Mok.

In interviews last year with an American reporter who observed portions of the trial, Pol Pot said that "My conscience is clear."

"I came to carry out the struggle, not to kill people" he explained. He insisted that estimates that millions had died during the Khmer Rouge reign were overstated. "To say that millions died is too much," he said.

Washington Times

April 9, 1998

Pg. 1

State Department seeks a 'major say' on weapons

Arms control agency's quest riles critics in Pentagon

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

State Department diplomats want a major say in what high-technology weapons systems the Pentagon develops.

Opponents of the plan argue that giving the State Department and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) their way will hobble work on missile and other defense programs.

John D. Holum, ACDA director and acting undersecretary of state, said in a letter to the Pentagon that its compliance review group should "coordinate" all important decisions with him "to avoid unexpected diplomatic and policy consequences stemming from compliance decisions."

Pentagon officials opposed to the plan said the new proposal is the latest in a string of efforts by anti-defense "arms controllers" in government to limit new weapons programs they think might violate agreements or complicate negotiations.

Similar disputes dating back to the 1970s led to the "dumbing down" of weapons systems — missiles, sensors or equipment that were made less effective militarily than their technology potential, they said.

Mr. Holum wrote in the March 13 letter to Walter Slocombe, undersecretary of defense for policy, that "my office" should be notified of controversial issues "at the earliest stages" of the group's evaluations, and then again before final decisions are implemented.

"It's not going to happen," said an administration official familiar with the Holum letter. "There is no good reason for it."

The official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said all controversial issues are already

discussed fully with other agencies.

"But at the end of the day the decision on how a weapons systems is going to be built and what attributes it will or won't have is a decision for the Department of Defense, not some bunch of bureaucrats who are arms controllers," he said.

Allowing arms control political decisions to enter into weapons development could delay development and boost costs of weapons systems, the official said.

"It also, in the worst case, would allow a target-rich environment for people who are trying to hobble our programs," the official said.

A spokesman for Mr. Holum had no immediate comment.

Pentagon officials say the Holum plan is a bad idea because it would dramatically alter the focus of the compliance review group.

"Compliance determinations are essentially legal findings — determinations of whether a given program, test or design is permitted by a treaty, not whether it's a good idea from a policy standpoint or whether it has any military utility," said one official.

"The net effect would be to ensure that compliance determinations will reflect not what is permitted by U.S. treaty obligations but what the interagency groups believe are advisable in light of a myriad of other considerations, including arms control ambitions and diplomatic efforts," the official said.

The cumbersome bureaucratic

approval process under the Holum plan would give the State Department, ACDA and White House National Security Council staff the ability to "dress up their policy desires as legal compliance determinations," the official said.

"This in turn would enable the administration to claim that certain activities are noncompliant when in fact they're merely undesired by the administration," he said.

Mr. Holum is seeking to alter the compliance process because his agency in the past was embarrassed by Pentagon compliance determinations that ACDA was trying to negotiate away in arms control talks, officials said.

"Holum's power grab here is intended to ensure that future compliance determinations don't declare any activity legal if it would impede his ability to make arms control agreements," the official said.

An internal government controversy erupted in 1993 over the testing of the Pentagon's Theater High-Altitude Area Defense, or THAAD, which the Pentagon initially declared could not be tested until after an agreement was reached with Russia clarifying the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Then in 1994 the compliance group declared that THAAD could

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

be tested with modifications. The determination took pressure off the Pentagon to accept Russian demands for limits on regional missile defenses and stretched out the talks.

Mr. Holum wrote to Deputy Defense Secretary John Deutch in 1994 asking that THAAD testing be halted while negotiations with Moscow were underway. The appeal was rejected by Mr. Deutch, who has since retired, in order to keep the program moving. It is

the Pentagon's first dedicated missile defense system and is needed by field commanders to defend against a growing missile threat.

Pentagon sources said Mr. Slocombe has not responded to Mr. Holum but is expected to do so.

The letter came after a March 9 discussion between the two officials that Mr. Holum said produced "a positive reaction" from Mr. Slocombe to the plan.

The administration official said

that State Department and ACDA officials have been seeking to take control of the compliance review group for decades, and that during the Carter administration they attempted to interject themselves into the development of ground-launched cruise missiles.

"They are not engineers, and if they are engineers, they are not real engineers. They are arms control engineers," the official said. "The bottom line is the system ain't broke, and we ain't going to fix it."

Washington Post

April 9, 1998

Pg. 27

Bosnian War Crimes Suspects Arrested

Two Are Accused In 1992 Atrocities

By Colin Soloway
Special to The
Washington Post

SARAJEVO, Bosnia, April 8—British special forces today arrested two Bosnian Serb war crimes suspects wanted for alleged atrocities at the Omarska concentration camp, and they were transported immediately to the U.N. war crimes tribunal in the Netherlands.

The men were identified as Miroslav Kvocka and Mladen Radic, who were indicted by the International War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague, the Dutch capital, for their alleged roles in running the Omarska camp outside the northwestern Bosnian town of Prijedor, where hundreds of Muslims and Croats were murdered in the spring and summer of 1992.

The two men stand accused of participating in some of the most horrific human rights abuses of the 1992-1995 Bosnian conflict. As commander of the Omarska camp during its first month of operation and later as a deputy commander, Kvocka, 41, was allegedly aware of various crimes against humanity committed by its guards, including repeated beatings and rapes, torture, and murders of Muslim and Croat inmates.

As a subordinate to Kvocka, Radic, 45, commanded the guard force working one of three shifts at the camp. He was specifically charged with dragging a woman interned at the camp in June and July 1992 -- identified in the indictment only as "A" -- from her cell and raping her over an extended period.

The arrest took place late this afternoon in the British-administered sector of Bosnia.

Diplomatic sources in Washington said the operation was carried out by a relatively small detachment of British SAS troops, a secretive group with special counterterrorism training. Both men were arrested in Prijedor without incident, the sources said, and they were swiftly taken by car to a NATO plane that transported them to the Hague. Radic was armed with a pistol but did not use it, the sources said.

No U.S. troops were involved, although the operation was approved by U.S. Army Gen. Wesley Clark, the top NATO military commander, following extended reconnaissance, a lengthy review, and detailed preparations, including special training. The region where the operation was conducted until recently was a bastion of hard-line Serbs who resented NATO's presence in Bosnia. Since January it has come under tighter control by a more moderate Bosnian Serb government elected in Banja Luka.

NATO officials have said the new government has improved the political climate for undertaking such operations in areas populated by Serbs, and U.S., British and NATO officials today stressed their mutual commitment to detaining additional indictees.

They also seized the occasion to issue a fresh warning to Radovan Karadzic, a former leader of the Bosnian Serbs indicted for his alleged role in the 1995 massacre of Muslims at Srebrenica, who has long

been protected in his hometown of Pale by heavily armed forces.

"He has no place to run and no place to hide," State Department spokesman James P. Rubin said of Karadzic. "It's time he realized that . . . the noose is gradually tightening around his neck."

Capt. Louis Garneau, a spokesman for the NATO-led Bosnian peacekeeping force here, said there were no injuries to NATO troops in today's operation. Reading from a NATO statement, Garneau said the indictees surrendered "when it was clear that their freedom of movement and attempts to evade were at an end."

The operation was the fourth against Bosnia's war crimes suspects by NATO-member forces since last July, when British special forces arrested one suspect in Prijedor and killed another who opened fire while resisting arrest. Since then, Dutch and American troops have captured two Croatian suspects and one Serbian suspect.

Seventy-four Serbs, Croats and Muslims have been pub-

licly indicted by the international tribunal. Kvocka and Radic's arrests bring the number in detention to 25. Two have been convicted and are currently serving their sentences. Others have been indicted but not named.

The Omarska camp was created by the Serbs in May 1992 on the outskirts of Prijedor to hold, interrogate and punish Muslims and Croats who had fled intensive shelling of the town before it succumbed to Serb forces. Many of the city's political and intellectual elite were confined there in unspeakable conditions, with starvation diets and no provisions for personal hygiene.

Despite their alleged role in the operation of the camp, the men arrested today were described in 1996 by the Boston Globe as having been employed for a time by the Prijedor police force under the command of another indicted war crimes suspect, Zeljko Meakic, who remains at large. But no NATO operation was attempted then, and Serbian police and interior ministry officials also refused to take action.

Staff writer R. Jeffrey Smith in Washington contributed to this report.

Hamis issued a leaflet calling for Muslims to attack Jewish targets around the world to avenge the killing of its top bomb maker, even though the Palestinian Authority cleared Israel. Separately, an Israeli official met with a U.S. envoy to report on progress on a West Bank withdrawal plan.

Wall Street
Journal
April 9, 1998
Pg. 1

Congo briefly detained a member of a U.N. team investigating massacres during the recent civil war. The U.N. said the incident, the latest in a campaign of harassment, could herald the end of the inquiry.

Hot Game in Bosnia: Where in the World Is Karadzic?

New York Times

April 9, 1998

By Chris Hedges

PALE, Bosnia-Herzegovina -- Dr. Radovan Karadzic, the Bosnian Serb wartime political leader who has roamed freely since being indicted on war-crimes charges in 1995, is under pressure from NATO forces and appears to have left his headquarters here. But how far he has gone is a matter of debate.

Officials in Washington say they believe he has remained in the region. Senior Western officials in Bosnia say he may have traveled further.

"He may have just left Pale temporarily," said Carlos Westendorp, the top international official in charge of putting into effect the current peace agreement in Bosnia. "If I were him," Westendorp said, "I wouldn't stay in Pale."

But senior U.S. and British officials in Washington said that Karadzic remained "in the Pale area" to the best of their knowledge, and that "he's gone to ground, but not fled" the Bosnian Serb republic.

"He may end up fleeing," one senior U.S. official said. "But he hasn't yet."

The Washington officials said he had stayed in various towns, including Montenegro, Belgrade and a bunker at Han Pijesak, where his military counterpart, Gen. Ratko Mladic, has often stayed.

"The evidence is that he's getting jittery," a senior official in Washington said.

The reports about Karadzic coincide with the arrests Wednesday of two other Bosnian Serb war-crimes suspects by NATO peacekeepers and follow an unannounced inspection here last week by several hundred NATO troops accompanied by tanks and armored personnel carriers. They inspected a police unit based in a factory where Karadzic has an office and confiscated 10 rifles and 1,500 rounds of ammunition.

The two Bosnian Serbs, arrested in Prijedor by NATO-led forces in Bosnia, were Miroslav Kvočka and Mladen Radic, close allies of Karadzic in the war.

They are charged by the

war-crimes tribunal with running a detention camp in the Bosnian town of Omarska, outside Prijedor. Many prisoners, who included Muslim and Croat leaders and intellectuals, were taken from the camp and executed, their bodies dumped down nearby mine shafts, investigators said.

The indictment says: "The prisoners were held under armed guard, in brutal conditions. They were murdered, raped, sexually assaulted, severely beaten and otherwise mistreated."

One of the four buildings in the camp, the "red house," was an execution site from which "most of the prisoners who were taken to it did not emerge alive," the indictment said.

Kvočka, 41, was deputy camp commander, and Radic, 45, was a shift commander. The men, indicted in February 1995, were arrested without shooting and were sent on an airplane to the war-crimes tribunal in The Hague.

Western diplomats here said that the arrests, carried out by special units in an area under the control of British troops, were a further indication that the circle was closing on Karadzic.

"Time is running out and he has probably figured this out," said a Western diplomat in Sarajevo.

Special forces from France, the United States, the Netherlands and Britain have been training for weeks to seize Karadzic from Pale, seat of the Bosnian Serb wartime leadership, according to Western diplomats. The officials, who said they were unsure where Karadzic was or whether he had temporarily left Pale, said an effort to abduct him in a few weeks and take him before the war-crimes tribunal was under serious consideration.

"Karadzic's days at large are becoming shorter and shorter," Westendorp said. "His power base has diminished. He no longer has political control. His special police are now under the control of SFOR, and the money he was able to make off the black market is scarcer and scarcer. The rope around his

neck is tightening. Within a month he should be in The Hague, either because he goes voluntarily or because he is taken."

SFOR refers to the NATO Stabilization Force, as the peacekeepers are known.

The Washington officials said, however, that an arrest operation for Karadzic had not been ruled out, but that neither was it imminent and that keeping him nervous and on the run was an important goal in itself.

The Belgrade daily *Vecernje Novosti* reported Tuesday that Karadzic had fled Pale, but that his wife remained there. Although there has been no sign since January of the flamboyant psychiatrist with his distinct mop of unruly hair and trademark white silk scarf, his wife was reported to have been seen in Pale last week.

NATO commanders have estimated that they would need 800 troops backed by helicopter gunships and armor to capture Karadzic, who is guarded by 400 well-armed special police officers. The NATO commanders have been reluctant to seize him from Pale, fearing a violent backlash by the Bosnian Serbs against the 34,000 troops. NATO planners have estimated that an operation to seize Karadzic would leave 20 to 40 dead from the assault force.

Western diplomats in Sarajevo, however, said they believed that the heavy firepower at the disposal of the force would swiftly demoralize Karadzic's personal bodyguards. The diplomats also increasingly discount the possibility of reprisals by Bosnian Serbs who have seen their entity in Bosnia split in two, with a rival leadership based in Banja Luka that openly condemns Karadzic and his associates as war criminals.

"Two Apache attack helicopters and four tanks in front of his house would see these police surrender and leave like rats," a senior European diplo-

mat said. "I doubt at this point anything would happen."

In this sleepy mountain town 10 miles outside Sarajevo, there were signs that Karadzic's personal force of 400, equipped with rifles and grenade launchers, pulled out Monday, if not before.

A guard post less than 100 yards from Karadzic's house, usually staffed day and night, stood empty. The house itself, usually surrounded by the police, also appears to have been abandoned. A burly unarmed man stood on the road near the property, and when questioned about the house told visitors to leave.

The building with Karadzic's office seemed deserted, and the usual contingent of officers at the front gate was absent. The Washington officials said the fact that the guards were gone was likely to mean only that Karadzic was not living there, and they noted that he is often not there, changing his sleeping sites a la Saddam Hussein.

Neighbors of Karadzic said they had noticed nothing unusual and insisted that he had not lived in his house for months.

Western diplomats in Sarajevo, who said they did not know Karadzic's whereabouts, warned that any country offering him refuge would be pressured to turn him over to the international court in The Hague.

The war-crimes tribunal has charged both Karadzic and Mladic with genocide and crimes against humanity. They are accused of overseeing the murder of thousands of Muslims and Croats in the war, having driven tens of thousands from their houses in a campaign of "ethnic cleansing."

Westendorp said there were numerous rumors that Karadzic might seek refuge in Russia or Serbia, adding, "I would guess that the only safe country for him at the moment is North Korea."

While conference promises to offer contentious debate...**CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS PROMISE QUICK ACTION ON FY-98 SUPPLEMENTAL**

In an effort to forestall a possible furlough of Defense Department employees, congressional leaders plan to complete the House-Senate conference on their respective fiscal year 1998 emergency supplemental appropriations bills and conduct floor votes by the first week of May, Capitol Hill sources said this week.

Republican congressional staffers are working during this month's recess to lay the groundwork for the lawmakers who will try to mete out a compromise between two very different supplemental bills. Most members will return to Washington the week of April 19. "Our No. 1 concern when they get back is DOD. They've told us about their financial situation. Right now they're borrowing from fourth quarter funds," one congressional source said on April 6. "We're going to push hard to get this under way immediately."

Another congressional aide said on April 6 that House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA) has personally told Defense Secretary William Cohen House leaders will push to complete a conference and conduct a floor vote for the FY-98 supplemental by the first week of May. Cohen reportedly told Gingrich during that conversation that if action on the supplemental is not completed by the beginning of next month, DOD will be forced to consider a civilian work force furlough.

Both Cohen and Gen. Henry Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have told other lawmakers they would like action on the supplemental bill completed by the beginning of May, or cuts would have to be made in training the forces.

"What I've indicated to Congress is... they've got to reconcile this when they come back [from the April recess]. Absent that reconciliation, then obviously we'll have to cut back and take... draconian measures," Cohen said at an April 2 press conference.

In testimony last month before the House National Security Committee, Shelton suggested DOD may have to furlough civilian employees if the supplemental is not passed within the time constraints outlined by DOD.

The Pentagon is indeed considering that possibility, a Pentagon spokesman told *Inside the Pentagon* on April 8.

The House and Senate late last month crafted two differing emergency supplemental appropriations bills in response to President Clinton's \$1.85 billion request for emergency funding for ongoing Bosnia and Iraq operations. The president's FY-98 request includes \$485 million for military operations in Bosnia and \$1.36 billion for forces deployed in the Persian Gulf (*Inside the Pentagon*, March 26, p1).

The supplemental bills worked on in both houses largely conform to the president's request for funding these ongoing operations, but, unlike the Senate bill, the House version includes an amendment offered by Rep. Bob Livingston (R-LA) that would offset the funding for those military operations with cuts in domestic programs.

These cuts include \$1.93 billion from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and \$75 million from the Department of Education's bilingual and immigrant education program.

The Senate's bill, on the other hand, includes provisions that will increase defense spending. The Senate version includes domestic offsets only to compensate for certain domestic spending sought in the supplemental bill.

On the defense side, the Senate added, for example, \$151 million to enhance theater missile defense programs, and roughly \$272 million to enable the Marine Corps to buy eight Boeing F/A-18D aircraft (*Inside the Navy*, April 6, p9).

Democratic staffers this week cast doubt on the Republicans ability to engineer an agreement between House and Senate leaders on a supplemental within that time frame. These sources said the two sides are so far apart, gridlock is almost certain to result.

"We may see a repeat of last year when the Republicans failed to pass a disaster relief bill before a long recess, and the political fallout was disastrous for them," a Democratic staffer said on April 6.

The source added that if the Republicans next month fail to pass an emergency supplemental bill -- especially one that is intended to benefit troops stationed overseas -- voters will be outraged again, and the ensuing political damage will be magnified because this is an election year.

According to several of the Democratic sources, the Republicans' problems are made worse if they come out of conference with the House rescissions in domestic programs intact.

"It's a sure veto. Clinton will say we shouldn't be paying for this bill by cutting housing for the poor," one of the sources said on April 6. "The Republicans will not look good in the eyes of the voters."

More than one Republican staffer on the Senate side agreed with that assessment. One of them called an attempt to cut domestic programs to pay for defense spending "political suicide" in an election year.

Several House congressional staffers downplayed such concerns, expressing confidence that their case will be made to the public that domestic offsets are needed to maintain the balanced budget agreement and safeguard a depleted defense budget.

Most of the Republican congressional staffers interviewed this week said they expect a particularly acrimonious conference over the two supplemental appropriations bills. "The two bills are apples and oranges, everyone agrees it will be an extremely difficult conference," one Republican source said April 6. -- *Keith J. Costa*

Christian Science Monitor

April 9, 1998 Pg. 1

Taking Drug War Too Far?

A proposed antidrug center would keep US troops in Panama after 1999 canal handover.

By Howard LaFranchi
Staff writer of The
Christian Science Monitor

PANAMA CITY - On a tropical patio in a middle-class neighborhood, a group of Panamanian intellectuals sit around a table littered with position papers, sodas, and bowls of limp cheese puffs. They are trying to figure out how to stop what they see as the next United States invasion of Panama.

"We've been an occupied country for 100 years," says Diogenes Arosemena, an international law expert. "So it's all the more painful that just when we thought we were about to become truly sovereign, we realize the American soldiers are coming again."

Talk of a US invasion in this Central American home to the Panama Canal may sound cold-war-ish and anachronistic, and probably comes as a surprise to the Pentagon. Under a US-Panama treaty ratified in 1978, the US is to relinquish control of the canal and all remaining military bases by Dec. 31, 1999.

But Mr. Arosemena and his friends say a proposed international drug-fighting center that would operate on one of the US military bases here, with the support of at least 2,500 US soldiers, means occupation all over again.

"Just as Britain turned over Hong Kong to China, the United States is to turn over its remaining military bases by the end of next year. But this [drug center] is a sure sign that both sides are getting cold feet," says Miguel Antonio Bernal, a prominent political analyst here.

"But what the Panamanian government thinks makes good economic sense, and what the US thinks serves its geopolitical interests, does not fit our vision of an independent Panama," he adds.

The proposed multilateral antidrug center, or CMA as it is known by its Spanish acronym,

may be literally unheard of in the US.

The idea is to provide a civilian-run facility where antidrug officials throughout the continent (and eventually perhaps Europe) could receive training and access to drug-trafficking intelligence.

"We've learned from experience that if you don't have countries working together on [drug trafficking], you just push the activity from one place to another," says US Ambassador to Panama William Hughes.

Yet because the center would include a sizable US military presence for logistical support - and perhaps because the Panamanian government has failed to explain openly what the CMA would and wouldn't do - the proposal is causing considerable hand-wringing in Panama.

And with the sense of uncertainty rising, it may well touch off an ugly demonstration or two before the issue is settled.

In the government's favor are opinion polls showing that a majority of Panamanians support some kind of US military presence.

That feeling dates from the canal's construction, but was heightened in 1989 after the US invaded to restore democracy and topple military strongman Manuel Noriega.

But Mr. Bernal and his "national consensus" group say such numbers reflect a fear of the unknown - the US has been a presence in Panama since President Theodore Roosevelt caused the new country to be carved out of Colombia in 1903.

That public uncertainty about a Panama without Uncle Sam can be reversed, they say, with education and national pride.

The CMA proposal actually came out of the office of President Ernesto Pérez Balladares in late 1995 as a response to those "US stay here!" opinion polls.

Many Panamanians were worrying about the effect of a full US withdrawal and an estimated \$200 million in lost economic activity. Some shippers and other business leaders were also jittery about the prospect of a canal without a US presence.

The government said it would only advocate creating such a center if it were multilateral and civilian-run.

The idea was also supported by the US, which carries out regional antinarcotics surveillance from the canal area's Howard Air Force Base, and which already hosts military liaison officers here from a half-dozen South American countries.

Howard's antinarcotics surveillance activities have already had a regional impact, US officials say, by curtailing the infamous "air bridge" that Colombian drug lords developed to ferry huge amounts of cocaine and other drugs north to the US.

A regional center would augment that, they insist, by offering more extensive training and reaching more participants.

US officials also strongly counter arguments that the CMA is nothing more than a US military base in disguise.

"We don't need a military base in Panama, and we certainly don't need it to project power or collect information today," says one US official in Panama. The center, unlike a military base, would not be fenced off from Panamanian society, the official says.

An agreement creating the CMA was set for signing late last year. But Panama surprised the US by presenting a new list of suggested amendments, most of which reflected con-

cerns of other Latin countries, especially Mexico and Brazil.

The concerns included wording that speaks vaguely of other uses for the center beyond antinarcotics work that would leave the door open to US military intervention in the region. The US and Panama say the wording refers to benign activities like disaster relief.

Mexico especially appears to be concerned that the center would be another step toward what it considers a worrisome militarization and creeping interventionism of regional antidrug activities.

Those arguments and more are fueling Panamanian opposition to the center. Critics like Bernal say the "secrecy" in which the Panamanian government has cloaked the proposal only raises doubts.

Some US officials agree with that point, saying the government could have taken the proposal to the people "in town hall format" without revealing sensitive specifics. Other opponents, like Panama City architect Ricardo Bermudez, say the center would disrupt the chance this booming city was finally getting to integrate its "heart" with the rest of the community.

"These bases occupy some of the city's finest jewels, and Howard is [in] the heart of the heart," he says.

Yet like other critics, Mr. Bermudez says the central drawback of the CMA proposal is that it denies Panama the possibility to finally stop living as an "adolescent" under the American guardian and develop as a truly sovereign nation.

"No one's against waging this battle against drugs," he says. "But at what price for Panama?"

Minneapolis Star Tribune April 9, 1998

Former Unisys engineer files 'whistleblower' suit

Steve Alexander
Star Tribune

A former Unisys Corp. software engineer has filed a federal "whistleblower" lawsuit in U.S. District Court in Minneapolis alleging more than

\$500 million in fraud on U.S. Navy contracts by the former Unisys operations in Eagan and its subsequent owners, Loral Corp. and Lockheed-Martin Corp.

The suit, which alleges that Unisys and the subsequent owners overcharged the Navy

for computers, was filed by Erik Gundacker of Rosemount. Under federal whistleblower rules, an individual may sue for wrongdoing on behalf of the federal government and receive as much as 30 percent of any money recovered as a result of the suit.

An attorney representing the three corporations denied the suit's allegations. Unisys sold its Eagan defense operations to Loral in 1995, and Lockheed-Martin bought Loral in 1996.

Gundacker's suit was filed

in January 1996, but until Wednesday it remained under a court-ordered seal pending a government review of the suit's fraud allegations. However, the U.S. Attorney's office in Minneapolis has declined to join the suit on behalf of the government.

Dale Nathan, an Eagan attorney representing Gundacker, said, "Unisys lied to the Navy about the computers it sold them. The company told the Navy it would be too difficult transfer computer programs

from a \$1 million computer to a \$20,000 computer, and the Navy believed them." The suit alleges that the deception continued under Loral and Lockheed-Martin.

It is the second time Gundacker has raised the same fraud allegations in federal court. After he was laid off from Unisys in 1994, he sued Unisys for wrongful discharge. But that suit was dismissed in U.S. District Court in Minneapolis in 1996 on the grounds that evidence did not link Gun-

dacker's termination with the fraud allegations. The original suit didn't put a dollar value on the alleged fraud. Gundacker has appealed the dismissal of the earlier case.

Donald Lewis, an attorney with the Minneapolis firm of Hallelend, Lewis, Nilan who represents Unisys, Loral and Lockheed-Martin, said, "These are groundless claims of contract fraud. We're confident that this case, like his other case, will be found to have no merit."

Pacific Stars & Stripes April 10, 1998

Pg. 1

Military says some refusing anthrax

★ Seven sailors from the USS Independence appear at captain's mast for not taking shot.

Stripes and wire reports

WASHINGTON — The Navy has punished 14 sailors — seven from the Japan-based USS Independence aircraft carrier — for refusing to take an anthrax vaccine, and two airmen also have refused to take the shots, military officials said Thursday.

More than 15,000 U.S. military members in the Persian Gulf, where about 37,000 U.S. troops are stationed, have started taking the series of inoculations, military officials said.

In December, Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered all 1.5 million men and women in the services to take the shots to protect them against a potential attack with the biological warfare agent.

The inoculation program began several weeks ago in the Persian Gulf, where a potential of attack from Iraq's Saddam Hussein was deemed highest.

"The policy is the shots are mandatory," said Pentagon spokesman Col. Richard Bridges.

"It's that simple. They don't have a choice if they want to wear a uniform."

The refusals appear to stem from a wariness about the drug, which is not experimental and has been used for decades. Those who remain in the service "are being counseled, so

they will not be ill at ease" about taking the vaccine, said one military official, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

Seven sailors each from the two aircraft carriers in the Gulf — the USS John C. Stennis and the Independence — appeared at captain's mast hearings, where administrative punishments were handed out over the past several days.

"There are no other reports of anyone refusing the inoculations as of now," Lt. Cmdr. Gil Mendez, a U.S. Pacific Fleet spokesman at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, told Pacific Stars and Stripes on Thursday morning.

About 5,000 sailors, including Carrier Air Wing 5 personnel from Atsugi Naval Air Facility near Tokyo, are aboard the Independence, which departed from Yokosuka Naval Base in January for duty in the Persian Gulf.

Two sailors on the Stennis were discharged; both "had a pattern of misconduct,"

said Lt. Cmdr. Mark McDonald, a spokesman for the Navy's U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The Stennis is based in Norfolk, Va. The two men were discharged for "refusing to obey a lawful order" and were given administrative separations from the service, McDonald said. He declined to give any further details about the other misconduct allegations.

The other sailors received various levels of discipline ranging from restrictions to the ship, extra duty and reduction in rank in some cases, said Cmdr. Kevin Wensing, another U.S. Pacific Fleet spokesman.

All of the sailors were junior in rank and in their first term in the Navy, Wensing said. Two of the sailors on the Independence who had refused to take the shots later relented and their charges were dismissed, he said.

Air Force spokesman Lt. Col. Chris Geisel said the two airmen who have refused to take the shots could face disciplinary action and their exact status is unclear.

Mendez said the shots are given over a period of time. Initially, troops will receive three injections.

"Each shot will be given two weeks apart," he said. "There will also be an additional injection of five milliliters at the six, 12 and 18-month point."

Corpus Christi Caller Times

April 9, 1998

Navy: No plans to move training away

Chief of naval operations visits Coastal Bend, says changes are not needed

By Guy H. Lawrence
Staff Writer

The chief of naval operations on Wednesday said the Navy has no plans to move flight training from Coastal Bend bases despite a call for a new round of base closings.

At the end of a 2 and a half-day tour of South Texas naval installations, Adm. Jay Johnson, the Navy's highest-ranking uniformed officer, also said that mine warfare capabilities will eventually be expanded Navy-wide.

"I am not going to consolidate any training right now. We

have our bases very much engaged, as they are right now, and the training . . . is fundamental to our future," Johnson said. "I am not here to change the training equation."

Johnson came to South Texas to familiarize himself with the three area facilities: Naval Station Ingleside and

Naval Air Stations Kingsville and Corpus Christi. Johnson, who became chief of naval operations in 1996, said it was his first chance to visit Ingleside.

In future fleets, carrier battle groups and amphibious groups will have some mine warfare capabilities, Johnson said, instead of limiting the technology to the ships and helicopters of the Mine Warfare Command.

"The core of that capability resides in our Mine Warfare center of excellence in Ingleside," he said. "In a sense, what you are doing is exporting that expertise from Ingleside throughout the Navy."

Capt. Gary Belcher, deputy commander of Mine Warfare Command at NAS Corpus Christi, said that will likely mean more sailors will come to

Ingleside for training. Those changes are 10 to 15 years down the road and will not have an immediate impact on Ingleside, he noted.

"If you are putting organic systems onto the battle force, then you are going to need a place to train a whole lot more people," Belcher said. "The need is going to be there for our dedicated resources."

Johnson's visit to South Texas comes days after Secretary of Defense William Cohen called for two more rounds of military base closures. Cohen said the base closings are needed to save an initial \$20 billion and then \$3 billion annually.

This week, members of Survivor's Group, a state-hired consulting firm, visited Coastal Bend bases to develop ways for

local communities to retain their military facilities.

Johnson said he would not speculate on the survivability of NAS Corpus Christi. Johnson added that the Navy plans to reduce its ship fleet from 339 to about 300.

"What we are trying to do with the Navy is reshape ourselves into a leaner and more capable force," Johnson said. "I have concerns about the infrastructure side of our lives. Because as we go into the 21st century, we are carrying too much infrastructure."

Johnson also said Navy officials have not made a decision whether to move Mine Counter Measure Helicopter Squadron 14 from Norfolk, Va., to NAS Corpus Christi.

In 1996, the Navy proposed

bringing its two mine hunting helicopter squadrons to NAS Corpus Christi. HM-15 was moved to NAS Corpus Christi in 1996, after its home at Naval Air Station Alameda in California was closed. However, HM-14 is still housed at Norfolk, Va.

"We are still looking at that," Johnson said.

Johnson, who earned his wings at NAS Kingsville in 1969, said he appreciated the support local communities give the Navy and its sailors.

"We are proud to be here and I appreciate very much the way you take care of us," Johnson said. "We have a very important mission to carry out and the support of the community means a great deal of difference in our ability to carry out that mission."

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 9, 1998

Pg. 3

Congress cautious on new fighter

Super Hornet's cost and even its mission are raising doubts.

By Richard Parker

INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — For five months, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen threatened to hold up \$2 billion in planned spending for the Navy's newest fighter because of a persistent flaw: Just as the F/A-18 Super Hornet reached its combat speed of 500 miles per hour, the plane would rock.

The problem turned out to be small; the Navy recently solved it by drilling holes along the leading and trailing edges of the wings, stabilizing them. And, last week, Cohen approved the purchase of the first 20 of the planes that are expected to be the backbone of the United States' carrier-based force by 2008.

Yet the technical glitch flipped on the political warning lights, raising doubts on Capitol Hill about the plane's cost, timetable for development, even its purpose. In the coming months Congress will weigh whether to spend an additional \$3.3 billion next year for 30 more of the planes.

"The wing-drop caught people's attention. But it's not the basic issue anymore. The basic issue is what kind of airplane do we get?" said a senior Republican Senate aide, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

Many of the doubts spring from the Navy's claims that the E- and F-model Super Hornets — more powerful versions of the Hornets designed in the 1970s — can do what no plane has done: perform as a ground-attack plane, a fighter plane and a high-altitude bomber.

Experts doubt the multiuse claims. "The Navy is not capable of really providing bombers," said Tom Lomparis, an aviation analyst and national security professor at St. Louis University. "You can't get the same payload off a carrier deck that you can get off a land base. And yet they're claiming they can."

Supporters say the fighter unfairly is being picked apart because of its cost at a time when defense dollars are scarce. The Boeing Co. hopes to earn \$47 billion building about 500 of the planes in the next 20 years.

"There are people going after the Super Hornet for one simple reason: because they want to spend the money elsewhere," said Sen. Christopher S. Bond (R., Mo.), the plane's biggest advocate in Congress.

But detractors, including Sen. Russell D. Feingold (D., Wis.), argue that the Super Hornet is an adequate aircraft oversold as the ultimate aircraft. The Navy could keep flying old Hornets for less money, they argue. What's more, some lawmakers doubt that the plane has a clear role to play in the fleet.

Even as the Navy solved the problem with the wings, the General Ac-

counting Office reported that testing the Super Hornet would cost more than the Navy's claim of \$4.9 billion. Maintaining and upgrading the existing Hornet fleet instead of buying the new planes would save the Navy \$15 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Unless the Navy solves all the problems, said Feingold, "it should mean the end of the program."

The Navy's chief problem with the Super Hornet is that it doesn't have a rival. During the Cold War the military built planes to defeat particular Soviet aircraft. Today, the services are trying to assure Congress that new aircraft can counter threats that aren't well-defined.

"Ever since Desert Storm we've been looking to build in as much lethality as we can. We've been trying to eliminate specialized aircraft so you can change the mission by just changing the weapons," said Adm. Dennis McGinn, director of air warfare for the Navy, who concedes: "You're asking a lot of an airplane."

So far, the Navy has stayed within the cost limits imposed by Congress, said McGinn. The Navy projects that Super Hornets — which are one-quarter bigger than the old Hornets and have wings that are one-third bigger — will cost about \$77 million each. And Cohen has said he expects the program to remain on

schedule.

"Wing-drop has gotten a lot more discussion than it deserved and it's because of the kind of environment we're in now," said McGinn. "There's a lot of competition for dollars. And a problem which was very much routine was highlighted because people thought it was a potential chink in the armor."

With a Pentagon budget one-third smaller than it was just six years

ago, spending for new weapons is pitted against the expense of maintaining bases the services don't want, the cost of housing 1.4 million active duty troops with increasing numbers of families, and the rising cost of operations in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. In 1988, the Pentagon spent nearly \$250 billion a year on new aircraft; next year it proposes spending less than one-third of that amount.

The Pentagon has enacted new rules meant to eliminate costly design and production errors. Burned by buyer's remorse during the Cold War, as fleets of expensive planes showed flaws only after entering service, the military now buys planes in small batches at a time.

The Navy plans to buy its Super Hornets in groups: 20 this year, 30 in 1999, 36 in 2000, and about four dozen a year after that.

Corps says Marine alleging bias may have concocted story

Baltimore Sun
April 9, 1998

Pg. 2B

By NEAL THOMPSON
SUN STAFF

The Marine Corps said yesterday that a Marine claiming he deserted from Aberdeen Proving Ground because of ethnic discrimination may have concocted that story to get out of a military career with which he was disillusioned.

Pfc. Joshua Narins, 26, had told roommates, fellow soldiers and officers at Aberdeen that he was not adapting to military life and was looking for a way out, according to a preliminary investigation of Narins' harassment claims.

Narins, who enlisted in May and was based at Aberdeen's weapons school, said he went AWOL in mid-February after finding an ethnic slur written on the name plate on his barracks door.

At a news conference in Baltimore yesterday, Narins, 26, of New Jersey, said that the slur — "kike — gas em" — was the last in a se-

ries of harassments. He said someone had flipped his bed and stolen his laundry, his meal card and his car's license plates.

Narins disputed Marine officers' implications that he wrote the slur. He said he fled Aberdeen fearing for his safety. He spent a month sleeping in his car and at friends' homes in South Carolina and Massachusetts, where he had attended college, he said.

"I couldn't think," he said. "I couldn't walk back in there and say nothing had happened."

Narins is being represented by Tod Ensign, a lawyer with Citizen Soldier, a New York-based advocacy group for veterans and soldiers, and is asking Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Charles C. Krulak to investigate racism and "extremist activity" in the corps.

Narins said he would drive to Camp Lejeune in North Carolina to turn himself in and face desertion charges. Marines at Lejeune said late yesterday afternoon that

Narins had not arrived.

The Marine Corps has said it does not tolerate discrimination and will investigate his complaint.

"We're continuing our inquiry, doing a thorough investigation to make sure we leave no rock unturned," said Capt. Douglas Hibbard, a top Marine at Aberdeen.

But Marine officers at Aberdeen and in Washington said publicly and privately yesterday that Narins was a troubled soldier who had indicated a desire to leave the Marines.

"Still, even in light of all that, we're taking his allegation seriously," said Lt. Col. Scott Campbell, a spokesman at Marine headquarters in Washington.

At least two Jewish organizations — the Anti-Defamation League in Washington and the American Jewish Committee in Baltimore — said they were concerned about Narins' complaint and about the larger issue of extremism in the military.

But Lois Rosenfield of the American Jewish Committee said Narins' story had problems that prevented her group from giving him its full support.

Missile decision awaited today

Lockheed and Boeing vying to build JASSM for the Air Force

By GREG SCHNEIDER
SUN STAFF

The shape of things to come looks something like a stapler with wings.

The Pentagon will decide today what company gets to build the boxy Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile, kicking off not only a new generation of Air Force weapons but also the future of defense industry competi-

Worth a potential \$3 billion, the contract will be the first time the Pentagon has chosen between Lockheed Martin Corp. and Boeing Co. since the companies became the industry's top titans.

It also marks a chance for either company to get an advantage over their only other rival, Raytheon Corp., which is actually a bigger player in the specialized world of missiles.

"It's an important win for both companies," said defense expert Brett Lambert of the DFI International consulting firm.

The JASSM is intended to be a stealthy, long-range cruise missile — basically a

robot kamikaze rocket that can sneak past radar and explode itself on enemy air defense systems.

"It's sort of the ultimate of the weapons the Air Force would like to have after the lessons of Desert Storm," said Steve Zaloga, a munitions expert for the Teal Group.

The Iraqis protected their airspace with Vietnam-era missile systems that U.S. stealth fighter planes could evade with relative ease, he said, but the Air Force quickly realized that such an advantage would not last.

Since then, the breakup of the Soviet Union has flooded the globe with anti-aircraft equipment. "Now the Air Force doesn't want to have to fly into those lethal zones," risking \$50 million fighter

Baltimore Sun April 9, 1998

Pg. 1C

planes against sophisticated air defense systems, Zaloga said.

The JASSM can be fired from a fighter jet almost 200 miles from its target, and the missile will use satellite tracking to find its own way to the bull's eye.

Each missile is expected to cost between \$400,000 and \$700,000, and the Air Force wants to buy 2,400 of them. Most experts doubt that the program will be that big or attain its projected total cost of \$3 billion, partly because all defense programs are likely to shrink as the Pentagon juggles tight budgets, rising costs and the need to modernize.

JASSM also has its share of political problems. The Navy is supposed to be a customer, but its leadership has been distinctly cool toward the program. The Navy already has a similar weapon in its arsenal, a modified Harpoon mis-

sile called the Standoff Land Attack Missile Expanded Response, or SLAM ER.

Built by Boeing at the former McDonnell Douglas plant outside St. Louis, the SLAM ER has less than half the projected range of the JASSM but is the Navy's preferred weapon for its F/A-18 fighter jets.

Some analysts say Boeing's experience with the Harpoon and the SLAM ER make it the favorite to win the new contract, though that also means the company has more at stake.

Lockheed Martin currently makes no cruise missiles, "so it would be a bigger win for them," Lambert said. The company is running the program out of its Electronics & Missiles business in Orlando, Fla.

"For either company, it will be

important as something to build their missile business going forward," said Merrill Lynch analyst Byron Callan. "It will also be a brick in the foundation on which to compete against Raytheon."

But, because of the tension between the Air Force and the Navy over the program, and because its stealth technology swings the JASSM into the classified realm, experts have little information about the differences between the Lockheed Martin and Boeing proposals.

Both companies' designs look like small, blind airplanes, with stubby wings and the squared-off edges of radar-evading stealth technology. Both can be launched from a long menu of aircraft, hug the low end of the cost range and use the global positioning system satellite network for navigation.

Inside the Pentagon

April 9, 1998

Pg. 3

Cohen called methodology 'seriously flawed'

ASSAILED BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ON OUTLAY SCORING, CBO STRIKES BACK

Two days after Defense Secretary William Cohen called the Congressional Budget Office's methodology for projecting future outlay rates "seriously flawed," CBO Director June O'Neill responded with a letter to Congress noting that her organization's estimates have historically turned out to be closer to the actual rates than the administration's figures. Last week, the Senate passed a fiscal year 1999 defense budget resolution that utilizes the higher CBO outlay figures, resulting in \$3.6 billion less funding available for defense than the president had sought.

The Pentagon has pushed Congress to accept the projected outlay rates offered by the White House Office e fiscal year to implement budget authority. CBO recently came up with an estimate that would suggest that more than \$3.6 billion in additional funds would need to be available in FY-99 if Congress were to approve President Clinton's proposed topline budget authority for the Defense Department of \$270.6 billion.

Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (R-NM) last month opted to embrace CBO's estimate rather than OMB's. But in order to honor the caps on defense spending included in last year's bipartisan balanced budget agreement, Domenici's action would limit defense outlays in FY-99 by \$3.6 billion (*Inside the Pentagon*, March 12, p1). The Senate budget chairman's move has angered Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Strom Thurmond (R-SC) and other conservatives who would like to see increased, not decreased, spending on defense.

Cohen on March 24 wrote Thurmond to underscore the defense secretary's belief that CBO's methodology for estimating outlays was inferior to OMB's because CBO fails to take the "bottom-up" approach for determining spending that the White House budget office does (*ITP*, April 2, p3).

Cohen registered his "strong objections" to the spending cuts that would result from Domenici's version of the budget resolution, which was adopted by the full Senate in an April 2 voice vote. Thurmond ultimately decided not to offer an amendment he had drafted that would have allowed additional spending for defense, sources said.

Noting his view that CBO's estimates are "seriously flawed," Cohen said the resulting reductions "would have a severe, and I believe, unacceptable impact on both our current military readiness and our future modernization."

In her March 26 letter to Domenici, obtained by *Inside the Pentagon* and reprinted with this article, O'Neill asserts that CBO "estimates are based on the same accounting information and legislative assumptions as the administration's estimates . . ."

But, she noted, as in each of the last four fiscal years -- 1994 through 1997 -- "CBO's estimate of outlays for problem with our estimates has not been that they were too high," as Cohen is implying, O'Neill wrote. "On the contrary, they were not high enough, and actual outlays exceeded our estimate by a few billion dollars in each year."

If the experience of the past several years "is any guide," O'Neill concluded, "our estimate is likely to be closer to the final result than the administration's figure."

As part of the budget resolution, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stevens (R-AK) that directed CBO, OMB and the Defense Department to work out the differences in their outlay estimates. However, congressional officials are skeptical that any of these agencies will back down on its budget estimating approach. -- Elaine M. Grossman

Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

New York Times

April 9, 1998

By Andrew Sullivan

WASHINGTON -- I think it's working," said Defense Secretary William Cohen, referring to the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay members of the armed services. He said this while announcing that discharges of homosexuals have increased by 67 percent since 1994. When you factor in the military's downsizing, the real figure is closer to 80 percent. If this is Mr. Cohen's definition of success, one wonders what failure would look like.

The real picture is actually grimmer. Although "don't ask, don't tell" forbids military commanders from pursuing investigations of suspected homosexual conduct without compelling evidence, violations of the policy not to ask, pursue or harass homosexuals have soared, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, the only watchdog group tracking discharge cases under this policy.

The organization has documented 563 violations by military authorities of "don't ask, don't tell" in 1997, a jump from 443 violations in 1996. Reported cases of physical and verbal harassment of gay service members rose 38 percent from 1996 to 1997; cases in which military authorities illegally "asked" troops if they were gay increased 39 percent.

Until August of last year, the military was still even using

enlistment forms that directly asked about a person's sexual orientation. In its report, the Pentagon said the original form was preserved for four years "as a cost savings measure."

Witch hunts have continued. In 1996, an airman convicted of forcible sodomy at Hickam Air Force Base had a life sentence reduced to 20 months in return for outing 17 other allegedly gay servicemen. All the accused air force men were discharged; the rapist served less than a year.

Secretary Cohen's improbable defense is that the vast majority of discharges were voluntary. The proof? None in the Pentagon report, except for this: "The Services believe that most of the [cases involving a disclosure of homosexuality] -- although not all of them -- involve service members who voluntarily elected to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers, supervisors or commanders."

That's what it comes down to: "the Services believe . . ." The report later concedes that "because extensive inquiries or investigations are not conducted in most of these cases, the reasons for [the increase in numbers] are not known and would be difficult to ascertain." Compare this with the documentation of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

The Pentagon further claimed that 80 percent of discharges were "statement" cases,

implying that individuals were discharged after spontaneously declaring their orientation to their superiors. But that is misleading at best. All that a "statement" case means is that the grounds for discharge arose from what a service member allegedly said, and not what he or she did.

Such "statements" can include private confessions to therapists, friends, peers or family members that were subsequently reported to military authorities.

I asked Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, how many of the 1,300 people her group has helped in the last four years have truly voluntarily disclosed their orientation. "None that I've come across," she said.

To its credit, the Pentagon does admit in its report that it has a problem. While insisting that the policy is "generally being implemented properly," the military concedes that it has not been vigilant enough in policing anti-gay harassment. As it now stands, someone attacked for being gay cannot report the abuse without risking discharge as a result.

The report also acknowledges that some women have been intimidated into not reporting sexual harassment, because they are sometimes accused of being lesbians if they reject male advances. More needs to be done to inform

commanders of the regulations, the report adds.

These admissions would be more encouraging if the record was not so damning. Last year, despite the 563 reported violations of "don't ask, don't tell," not a single military commander was disciplined for misconduct.

It's now clear that the policy has not simply failed. It is far worse than what went on before. Gay service members are now allowed into the military, only to face a series of tripwires intended to flush them out. They have become, in effect, the unintended bait of rogue military commanders. Other, more decent officers (and there are many) simply do not know the rules, since the Pentagon has done a poor job of telling them.

What to do about this? The Pentagon has embraced a mix of spin, denial and confession. The President has other options. Last year, he denounced employment discrimination against homosexuals. But as Commander in Chief, Bill Clinton has now fired more homosexuals than any other employer in America. Is it too much to ask that this President finally live up to his own words? Or with this President, is that now utterly beside the point?

Andrew Sullivan, a senior editor at The New Republic, is the author of the forthcoming "Love Undetectable."

USA Today

April 9, 1998

Discharges do tell

Crudely put: "Don't ask, don't tell" don't work. The rule was first implemented in 1994 as a way of protecting loyal and skilled soldiers and sailors from being run out of the military simply because they were gay. But according to a Defense Department study released this week, the number of homosexuals discharged from the military as a consequence of their sexual orientation has grown 67% since 1994, to 997 last year - just opposite the law's desired effect.

Defense officials say one problem is that a few commanders "haven't gotten the message" to lay off. The report recommends heightened training and closer legal review of so-called "coming out" cases. Officials also say some enlistees are using homosexuality as an excuse to get out of the military early. The most common discharge, says the report, "involves a junior enlisted member who makes a statement declaring his or her homosexuality . . . early in the member's term of service."

Either way, the don't-ask compromise so carefully hammered out by Congress, the White House and the Pentagon con-

tinues to distinguish between gays and straights with a prejudice against gays. If you even claim to be gay, you are excused from your enlistment. That's just another way of expressing the prejudice that homosexuals aren't suitable for military service.

More to the point, the don't-ask statute institutionalizes other prejudices. It states that homosexuality per se is not reason for discharge; there must be homosexual conduct. But if you are gay, the law automatically presumes that you have engaged in such conduct.

The study says the number of discharges resulting from actual "acts" of homosexuality is down 20%, as if this is evidence that investigations of gay service members have declined and the law is working. But the law makes those investigations moot. To stay in the service, an outed gay or lesbian has to prove he or she has not had homosexual relations, a requirement that turns the notion of innocent until proven guilty right on its ear.

You might argue that the don't-ask statute has at least started to change military attitudes. And in some narrow ways, that may be true. But the benefits would be easier to celebrate if discharges weren't rising. As it is, the right conclusion is not that don't-ask is working, but that it never will truly work at all.

U.S. Public Acutely Uninterested in Vote on NATO

Expansion Europe: The stakes are high, but weak opposition and lack of a crisis atmosphere almost ensure Senate approval.

By Tyler Marshall, Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON--After one of Congress' most curious debates on a major international issue, President Clinton's signature foreign policy initiative--enlarging NATO--seems headed for easy Senate ratification later this month.

That is, if senators ever get around to voting.

Confused efforts to shoe-horn the final hours of discussion on expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into gaps in a floor debate on education last month reflected the fact that the issue, although enormously important for the United States, has barely raised the average American's eyebrow.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) eventually suspended the embarrassing on-again, off-again debate, saying he would try again later--most likely when the Senate returns from its Easter recess.

A widely expected yes vote in the Senate would effectively approve the extension of Washington's most enduring military alliance--and the U.S. defense burden--hundreds of miles eastward in Europe to include three newly democratic countries: Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Public Not Stirred

The pros and cons of expanding the Atlantic alliance have been hotly discussed among the United States' blue-suited foreign policy elite. Some members hail it as a vital ingredient for European stability; others dismiss it as pure folly--an almost whimsical extension of Washington's obligations that will devalue the nation's defense shield, weaken the alliance and needlessly alienate Russia.

These views have fed more than a thousand editorials and opinion-page articles in American newspapers, countless think-tank seminars and upward of a dozen congressional hearings. Last year, a bipartisan

group of 28 senators was formed to plumb the issue, and Clinton hired an advisor whose sole task has been to get the 67 Senate votes needed for ratification.

"Few votes before the Senate have as much far-reaching significance as this," declared Sen. William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.), kicking off last month's floor debate.

Maybe so, but for the general public, NATO expansion remains a yawn.

Despite the vigorous debate among policymakers and the enormous stakes, the only questions coming from the street seem to be "Does it matter?" and "Who cares?"

An opinion survey on major current events released Friday by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press found that only 5% of those questioned were following the NATO enlargement issue "very closely." By comparison, an earlier survey during a standoff with Iraqi President Saddam Hussein indicated that nearly half the population was following events in Iraq intensely.

The latest Pew study also found that the number of Americans with any opinion on the issue has dropped off sharply since Clinton and other NATO leaders formally invited the three countries to join at a Madrid summit last summer. Nearly one in three Americans questioned last month admitted that they did not know if enlarging NATO was a good or bad idea.

"As an issue that matters, it's dropped off the screen," said the center's director, Andrew Kohut. As a result, the biggest extension of U.S. security commitments since the end of the Cold War is likely to pass into reality with little awareness on the part of most Americans.

Major Senate Backing

The reason for public apathy can be traced to two simple realities: the lack of a crisis over the alliance's enlargement and the inability of

opponents to mount a credible, sustained campaign against it.

All three candidate countries are stable, albeit young, democracies, threatened by no one and showing every sign of growing stronger with years. Committing to defend thousands of square miles of new territory in Europe might be important in the long term, but right now it lacks the drama and sense of confrontation of the recent standoff with Iraq.

In fact, one argument against expanding the alliance is that it is unnecessary.

But more important than this lack of drama is what one observer referred to as the "wall-to-wall" political support for an idea proposed by a Democratic president, embraced by the Republican Congress' "contract with America" and backed by most big names in the Senate.

"It's the last big hurrah for the old guard Europeanists," said a veteran Senate staffer, noting that support runs across the Senate's political spectrum, from North Carolina's Jesse Helms on the Republican right to Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts on the Democratic left.

So strong is support for the initiative that it easily survived major fudging on cost estimates, which miraculously shrank from \$100 billion to around \$1.5 billion as soon as bickering between the U.S. and European allies began over who would pay the bill. Worries about the move's impact on relations with Russia have also generated no serious opposition.

U.S. lawmakers know enlargement is good politics: Americans generally view NATO as a successful alliance and nearly 30 million citizens trace their roots to Central Europe. Defense contractors, sensing additional business, have also backed the issue.

As the vote nears, between 75 and 85 of the 100 senators are viewed as either favoring expansion or leaning strongly in that direction.

The Russians Care

The lopsidedness of the political forces aligned in favor of expansion has led expert opponents to claim that the potential consequences of such an important step haven't been properly aired.

Although NATO enlargement might not be a big deal to most Americans, it is definitely an attention-grabber in the affected European countries.

In Poland, alliance membership is an emotional, high-profile issue, viewed as a long overdue fulfillment of the country's desire to be part of the West. When leaders across Poland's political spectrum delivered a letter to U.S. Ambassador Daniel Fried in Warsaw last month pledging to vote the funds necessary to underwrite the country's NATO membership, it was a media event. "Television, the press from all over Poland were there," Fried said. "This is a country where everyone knows what NATO is."

Russians also know what NATO is, and they worry about watching an alliance created to contain Moscow move closer to their frontiers. Despite assurances from the West that enlargement is not aimed at them, Russians see it as a veiled threat to their nation's security.

"When divisions are moving closer to your border, you can't explain to your people that this is a gesture of friendship," said Yuli M. Vorontsov, Russia's ambassador to the U.S.

More than this, however, Russian moderates fear that NATO enlargement could become a political weapon in the hands of nationalist extremists who paint expansion as part of a larger conspiracy against Russia. Vorontsov noted that Russia's next parliamentary elections are due in June 1999, two months after a NATO summit planned in Washington to celebrate the alliance's 50th birthday and welcome its new members.

"It offers the possibility of a field day for the nationalists,"

Vorontsov predicted. "The problem with Americans is they don't play chess. They don't think three or four moves ahead. Enlargement will have repercussions that are unwanted."

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 9, 1998

Pg. 4

The United Nations has agreed to monitor Cambodia's July 26 elections, hoping the presence of foreign observers will ensure that the vote is free and fair, U.N. officials said yesterday. Cambodian strongman Hun Sen has called for parliamentary elections to earn international legitimacy and coveted aid dollars, which were cut off after he ousted his co-prime minister, Prince Norodom Ranariddh, in a July coup.

Washington Post

April 9, 1998

Pg. 3

MARY McGRORY

Not Too Late for NATO

Promoters of the expansion of NATO should thank their lucky star. That would be Kenneth Starr, the independent counsel who kept the nation's attention on Cupid and Venus at the White House, when Mars should have been under discussion. That would be the curious plan to add three weak countries to our European military alliance who can bring nothing but need to the ranks.

The inclusion of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic was widely held to be the principal casualty of the national preoccupation with the president's private life, which was brought to us by our supremely clueless Supreme Court. We can't be sure that water-cooler and bar conversation would have flowed otherwise to a bigger NATO. But if it had, the talk would have provided more headscratching than Kenneth Starr and his merry men. Hearings were held, and a lackluster debate, but Republican leader Trent Lott pulled the issue from the Senate floor for action after recess. The central question—why?—was never answered. It wasn't even asked.

"We are trying to spread stability," said Defense Secretary William Cohen at a press breakfast this week. In his pre-Pentagon days, he was opposed to the expansion for reasons that he now spends a great deal of time refuting.

NATO expansion has considerable political support. Eastern European ethnics are dead-keen on it. So is the military-industrial complex, which can see the fat contracts coming from the makeover of three decrepit military organizations. None of these fans can provide the name of the enemy against which the planes, tanks and missiles would be launched.

Secretary Cohen said that the Russians, including President Yeltsin, had been reassured by reassurances from him, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and the president, that NATO wasn't aiming any weapons at Moscow.

The mission is said to be to strengthen democracy and the economy in these weary, depleted nations. He was asked if

there could be a better candidate for the spread of stability than Russia. He never answered, but it seems to have everything: a shaky government, a fragile democracy, a volatile leader—and oh, yes, some 20,000 nuclear bombs which Russian officials said they would have to count on if called upon to defend themselves against a larger military force.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), the smartest man in the Senate, called this chilling eventuality to his colleagues' attention—to little effect. They are also deaf to warnings about cost. Who can tell the price for upgrading the forces of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic so that they will be carrying their weight? Administration officials lowball the cost, at a mere \$1.4 billion. But retired Adm. Eugene Carroll of the Center for Defense Information says the revamping could run as high as \$135 billion.

Susan Eisenhower, Ike's granddaughter and president of the Center for Political and Strategic Studies, exhorted the senators to remember how well the world was served by U.S. generosity to defeated enemies, as to Germany after World War II.

"After the Cold War, we had a major opportunity to do for Russia what we did for Germany after World War II," she said. Senators are apparently too pleased with a rare chance to please both the

president and the Senate Republican leader. New York Times columnist Thomas L. Friedman has been diligently pointing out the essential loopiness of the project, but foreign policy is a dead issue in Congress and this cart-before-the-horse proposition is thought to be an easy win.

Moynihan has an amendment to put the horse before the cart. Sen. John Warner (R-Va.), usually a stalwart of the defense establishment, has joined him in it. The idea comes from another defense stalwart, former senator Sam Nunn, one of the many strange bedfellows in the anti-expansion camp.

Moynihan and Warner propose that all applicants for NATO membership should first be admitted to the European Union. As Moynihan says, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic face no security threats, and the EU was founded for the purpose of strengthening political and financial institutions of countries that were warped by an iron dictatorship.

It doesn't take great intellect to figure out that a move that alienates the bear and encourages him to hang on to his nukes is not wise. And you don't have to have gone to Oxford to see that teaching democracy in uniform makes no sense.

Judge Susan Webber Wright liberated the Senate and the rest of us from round the clock attention to witless, loveless couplings and a commander in chief who has such weak defenses against temptation. The Senate has a chance to reject this absurd idea and prove that the effects of scandal on the brain are not irreversible.

Washington Times

April 9, 1998

Pg. 17

Illusion of unending NATO expansion

AMOS PERLMUTTER

It seems the Clinton administration is determined to bring an end to NATO as a military alliance and to transform it into an illusory collective-security enterprise. The administration has chosen to reduce the impact of its

folly and the disaster it is inflicting on NATO by going about its extension in an installment plan.

The first phase to be ratified by the Senate will include the three Visegrad states of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The second phase, sometime at the end of 1999, will usher the entry of Croatia, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria,

and assorted new and old entities. The third phase is reported to be the entry of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

This, the administration argues, may not take place on its watch, but it nevertheless wants to guarantee that there is an American presidential commitment to the entry of the three Baltic states and thus make it irreversible. That means that by the year 2000-plus will be as many new as old NATO members.

What are the implications of this exercise? NATO doubles its size and dilutes its original strategic and military purpose. I am going to address myself to the politically unrealistic action that will dilute or bury the original NATO.

According to a leading student of international politics, Glenn H. Snyder, "Alliances are formal associations of states for the use (or nonuse) of military force, in specified circumstances, against states outside their own membership."

NATO is still such an alliance. The function of an alliance historically has been to guarantee security for a state that enters the military alliance. Mr. Snyder simply defines security "as a high confidence of preserving, against external military attack, values presently held." By security we mean physical security.

What NATO extension will mean is the end of NATO as an alliance substituted for by some form of collective security or an alignment. By alignment we mean a relationship among states that goes beyond military security needs.

In fact, the Clinton administration's new document for the entry of

the Baltic states into NATO, now called Charter of Partnership, according to the New York Times, "embodies a moral and political commitment to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the three tiny lands, whose quest for independence sped the disintegration of the Soviet Union."

This, once again, will transform the nature and structure of NATO, making it hardly distinguishable from other European integration and federation forms such as the European Union and the various security organizations established by Europe. This, for all intents and purposes, brings an end to NATO as a military alliance. Since the interests of the new members are sometimes widely disparate — take, for instance, the cases of Hungary and Slovakia, who have ethnic and territorial claims on one another — the cohesion of the original NATO has been abandoned.

Alliances differ from alignments or collective-security systems by virtue of their orientations, expectations and purposes. While in an alliance system orientations and expectations are directed toward the same target in the old NATO, i.e. against the Soviet Union, an extended NATO has no clear target, goal, purpose or need. An alliance must be defined, once again, by its adversary, its friends and its foes.

The administration wants to have it both ways — Russia as a friend and Russia as a foe. If you don't believe that Russia is the adversary, then of course you can arrogantly proclaim, as did Undersecretary of State Strobe Talbott, as quoted in the New York Times: "Quite bluntly, Russians need to get over their neu-

ralgia on this subject."

The best guarantee for the Baltic states is, if not the neutralization of the borders with Russia, then reassuring the Baltic states by encouraging the Russians to withdraw forces from their borders. NATO extension to the Russian borders will achieve the opposite. One must be naive or foolish to believe that Russia will tolerate a force that is not designed as friendly. In fact, an extension of NATO to the Russian borders is simply presenting Russia with an unnecessary challenge that will not only fail to secure the Baltic states but can threaten them as well.

In the post-Cold War international system, when the greatest challenge to the United States comes from China, and when we badly need Russia as an ally to contain China, we are creating a Russian-Chinese alliance and a Russian-Iranian alliance.

This is an outrageous price for the strategically fruitless NATO extension. What is most disturbing about the enlarged multinational extension of NATO is that once in place and once a U.S. president has made a commitment it will not be possible for future administrations, Democratic or Republican, to reverse the trend. History has given the Clinton administration the golden opportunity to help organize a post-Cold War international system. NATO extension promises to be the obstacle for a stable international system beyond the year 2000.

Amos Perlmutter is a professor of political science and sociology at American University and editor of the Journal of Strategic Studies.

Washington Post

April 9, 1998

Pg. 25

Holbrooke's Prophetic Memoir

By Jim Hoagland

The first detailed insider account of foreign policy battles in the Clinton presidency emerges in a few weeks with the publication of Richard Holbrooke's diplomatic memoir on Bosnia. It is an unsettling, prophetic book that raises serious questions about the direction of U.S. involvement in the ethnic conflicts of the Balkans.

Advance copies of Holbrooke's "To End a War" are being circulated to policymakers and others as the flames of civil conflict lick higher in Serbia's Kosovo province. The parallels between the indecisiveness and confusion that initially split the United States and its European allies over

Bosnia, and the current diplomatic impasse on Kosovo, are as disturbing as they are evident.

Holbrooke is currently a Wall Street banker whose Washington career is in remission but far from over. Not surprisingly, he is full of praise for and protective of President Clinton. But taken as a whole his portrait of Clinton is that of an inattentive, disengaged chief executive forced by bureaucratic guile and circumstances into committing 20,000 U.S. troops to Bosnia because he had left himself no other option.

That portrait is especially devastating because it is largely inadvertent. Holbrooke, Clinton's assistant secretary of state

for Europe and architect of the Dayton conference that ended the Bosnian war in 1995, is a loyalist and a leading contender to be a Democratic secretary of state some day. He is not out to insult the future.

But neither does he turn away from unavoidable truth. He notes that presidential decision-making rarely occurred at the Principals' Meeting, the administration's highest deliberative internal forum, "because the real principals, the president and vice president, rarely attended them."

Instead, when disagreements flared up, "the decision-making process would often come to a temporary halt, which was followed by a slow, laborious process of telephoning and private deal-making. . . . Most high-level meetings on

Bosnia had a dispirited, inconclusive quality" that led to "inaction or half-measures instead of a clear strategy" in Holbrooke's first year in office, before the Croatian ground offensive and NATO bombing of the summer of 1995 cleared the way for success at Dayton.

Fittingly, the crucial scene of this description of how Clinton was dragged into exerting leadership on Bosnia that summer occurs at a glittering White House dance. The ego and concern for celebrity and social glamour that drive Clinton and many of his associates -- not least among them Holbrooke -- slip into view throughout the book.

At the end of that "magic" evening, Holbrooke tells an uncomprehending Clinton that the president will in fact have

to live up to a public promise Clinton has casually made to help allied troops out of Bosnia if the fighting continues. Unknown to Clinton, the Pentagon has hardened the promise into an operations plan already approved by NATO. To back out would wreck the alliance.

The idea that he has made a promise he cannot unmake finally engages Clinton's attention on Bosnia. This is the acorn that grows into the tree of Dayton in Holbrooke's account.

It is a brilliant bureaucratic manipulation, performed in the worthy cause of restoring American credibility and effectiveness abroad and maintaining history's most success-

ful alliance.

To those same ends, Holbrooke unblushingly tells of outflanking his main Washington rival -- Clinton's now departed national security adviser, Tony Lake, who temporarily shut Holbrooke out of key policy meetings -- and of prevailing over stuffy, vengeful French diplomats who wanted to deny the United States credit for success in Bosnia.

His account of Dayton rings true. If anything, Holbrooke underplays the audacity and courage he showed in bracing Clinton, and then in massaging the gangster mentalities of Serbia's Slobodan Milosevic and his Balkan rivals into

stopping the killing in Bosnia.

The book argues that only clear and forceful U.S. leadership, backed with real muscle where necessary, can contain the evil and threat to U.S. interests Holbrooke sees proliferating abroad. "There will be other Bosnias in our lives," he wrote only a few months before armed clashes between Serbs and Albanian Kosovans raised the prospect that the next Bosnia has already begun.

The administration's response on Kosovo has been uncertain and hesitant, voicing tough rhetoric but then backing off under pressure from the Contact Group -- a steering committee of European, Rus-

sian and American diplomats. Holbrooke quickly bent the Contact Group to American purposes instead of deferring to it on Bosnia, as the State Department seems now ready to do on Kosovo.

"The world will look to Washington for more than rhetoric the next time we face a challenge to peace or, as in the case of the Asian financial crisis, economic stability," Holbrooke writes at the end of his book, which is an indirect but broad challenge to the way U.S. foreign policy is now being conducted. "One cannot have a global economic policy without a political and strategic vision to accompany it."

Richmond Times-
Dispatch
April 9, 1998
Pg. 4

Bolivian army, police take control of region

LA PAZ, Bolivia — Hundreds of police and army troops took over Bolivia's coca leaf and cocaine producing region yesterday and cleared away roadblocks after a week of violence that left at least four dead.

Soldiers encountered some resistance but were able to clear the roads for hundreds of buses and trucks that had been stranded for nearly a week in the Chapare, a lush tropical region in the heart of the country.

Coca leaf farmers had used rocks and fallen trees to block traffic on the main road linking the eastern and western regions of Bolivia. They are demanding an end to coca leaf eradication and government plans to wipe out cocaine trafficking. They also want more alternative development programs in the region.

Washington Post

April 9, 1998

Pg. 25

Robert D. Novak

'Who Lost Colombia?'

Gen. Charles Wilhelm, commander in chief of the U.S. Southern Command, told Congress last week that narcotics-financed leftist guerrillas now control 40 percent of Colombia. An exaggeration by a tough Marine? Hardly. The heroic Gen. Jose Serrano, drug-busting commander of the Colombian National Police, says 50 percent of his country is gone.

Hence the question from Rep. Benjamin Gilman, chairman of the House International Relations Committee: "Who lost Colombia?" The obvious answer is the corrupt Colombian governing establishment, but dishonor must be shared by the Clinton administration. To avoid "another Salvador," U.S. policy is: hands off Colombia.

While the United States deepens its engagement in the faraway Balkans, it ignores the transition of Latin America's oldest democracy into its first narco-state, which provides 80 percent of the U.S. cocaine supply. At the Gilman committee's March 31 hearing, the State Department promised no badly needed helicopters but did announce a \$21 million increase in last year's \$90 million in aid. That compares with \$100 million a month provided to guerrillas by the drug trade.

Maj. F. Andy Messing of the National Defense Council Foundation, an expert on small wars, sees Colombia moving from the limited military engagements of what he calls Phase I in narco-guerrilla conflict to escalating warfare and government infiltration in Phase II. A "war of will and sustainment" in Phase III was presaged March 2 in southeastern Colombia's Caqueta region when some 800 guerrillas overwhelmed 152 elite troops—killing 80, capturing 40 and sending the bloody remnant into retreat.

This deterioration accompanied a drastic change in U.S. policy. Senior Clinton administration officials told me in 1996 that with the conclusion of the Cold War, blanket support for anti-guerrilla operations had ended. Residual help was trimmed because of President Ernesto Samper's ties to the drug cartels. The resulting cutoff of \$35 million in aid is blamed by the General Accounting Office for the failure of anti-drug activity.

At last week's hearing, Gen. Wilhelm described the Colombian army as "ill prepared to fight." The country's military budget has been cut 30 percent, leading Rep. Lee Hamilton (ranking Democrat on International Relations) to comment: "I don't think the Colombian government has the will to get the job done."

That will was not stiffened by the Clinton administration's refusal to send three state-of-the-art Blackhawk helicopters authorized by the appropriations bill signed into law last year by President Clinton. Gen. Serrano testified in Washington last week that his national police (who have suffered 4,000 deaths) desperately need the Blackhawks' greater range and altitude.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has quoted Gen. Barry McCaffrey, the federal drug czar, as saying the Blackhawks are not needed in Colombia. "Madeleine misquoted me," McCaffrey said in a recent private conversation. "I gave her the points, and she screwed it up. I never said we didn't need them. We'd like them, but this is the wrong way to do it." The general has told Republican congressmen shipment of just three Blackhawks would be "over my dead body."

Modern helicopters aside, 12 obsolete Superhuey choppers, promised Sept. 11, 1996, were never delivered. "Why is it taking so long to get nothing done?" asked Republican Rep. Roy Blunt of Missouri last week. Randy Beers, the new assistant secretary of state for narcotics, responded that "I've been wringing necks since I got this job. I'm not satisfied where we are." Chairman Gilman commented: "There's a war going on down there, and we're sitting back saying, 'We'll get to it.'"

The failure to supply helicopters is explained by

an unnamed State Department official quoted in the March 28 Post: "We are really not interested in getting sucked into this."

Bogota's alternative to help from Washington is increasing accommodation with the narco-guerrillas, the direction that President Samper has taken and that would be accelerated by his ally and possible successor Horacio Serpa. Considering Serpa's drug

ties, his election next month would surely doom all U.S. aid.

Andy Messing's Phase III, with "real power ... effectively transferred to narco elements," would be at hand. "In six months," Messing told me, "we will have reached the point where no amount of military or economic aid will do any good." Narcotics would flow here from Colombia unimpeded.

U.S. Should Opt Out of '72 Missile Pact

Los Angeles Times
April 8, 1998

Weaponry: The Soviet Union no longer exists and America now faces other threats.

By Bruce Herschensohn

Fifteen years ago, President Reagan gave a speech to the nation in which he asked, "Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them?" He then appealed to Americans to turn their great talents to development of an anti-ballistic missile system capable of destroying missiles before they could reach their targets.

I believe it was the greatest idea in the history of defense: a system not designed as a weapon, a system that would not kill one living creature but rather meant to destroy an incoming missile after it was launched, but before it hit its target.

To this day, the system does not exist. The greatest

stumbling block has been the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, signed as an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. That agreement put severe restrictions on both nations from deploying anti-missile technology, in effect, freezing both nations into what is called "mutual assured destruction."

There is, however, a provision in the treaty that is often overlooked. That provision is Section 2 of Article 15, which reads:

"Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests. It shall give notice of

its decision to the other party six months prior to withdrawal from the treaty. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having justified its supreme interests."

Let's do it. Let's give six months' warning. What are the extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty that have jeopardized our supreme interests? They should be obvious: The party with whom we signed the treaty no longer exists. There is no Soviet Union. Further, when there was a Soviet Union, that government continually violated its provisions, a fact now admitted by no less than the president of Russia. Moreover, ballistic missiles have proliferated

throughout the world, well beyond the two nations that signed the treaty.

To appease a power that no longer exists, we are gravely jeopardizing our ability to defend ourselves from other threats that do exist.

Unless all hostile governments are willing to sign such a treaty, and unless a new treaty has foolproof verification techniques that today do not exist, our government should be done with such agreements. Instead, our government should do what it is obligated to do by virtue of the U.S. Constitution: provide for the common defense.

- - - Bruce Herschensohn is a Distinguished Fellow at the Claremont Institute, a Conservative Think Tank Based in Claremont

Corpus Christi Caller Times
April 8, 1998

Trading bases for weapons

Cohen makes case for two new base-closure rounds.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen faces a daunting task. He plans to try to convince Congress to approve two more rounds of base closures to free money for new weapons systems. He argues that two new rounds could save up to \$2.8 billion annually.

Congress is skeptical, for good reason. Earlier rounds in 1988, '91, '93, and '95 didn't save as much as the Pentagon promised. The reason is that base closures are costly before savings are realized. Units have to be moved to other bases and sometimes new facilities built; and environmental cleanups at the closed bases are expensive.

Cohen is following a script written by former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and reaffirmed by Les Aspin. It calls for modernizing the armed forces largely with money saved by cutting domestic military bases and slashing the number of active-duty personnel. The plan would trade bases and military manpower for expensive new technology. The Pentagon and the administration contend that a smaller force is needed in the post-Cold War world, but that this smaller force will have increased combat punch from improved high-tech weapons.

In a Caller-Times Viewpoints Page article last Friday, Cohen said the military must find efficiencies in current operations. He said Defense's overall budget is down 40 percent since the height of the Cold War, the size of the armed forces is down 36 percent, but domestic bases have been cut by only 21 percent.

Some critics counter that the savings of earlier rounds have been negligible and that the military has been cut too much already. Earlier rounds closed 97 of the nation's major defense facilities. There have also been sharp reductions in troop strength and combat vessels. This risks fielding a force too small to respond to a major conflict while the new "leap-ahead" weapon technologies are still in the planning stage.

Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, in a Viewpoints Page response to Cohen's article, said that in the past five years "we have cut our forces too fast and too deep. We now have 500,000 fewer troops than we had during Desert Storm." She questions whether it's wise to close domestic bases while building temporary new facilities for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia.

This is a highly technical issue; we don't presume to know the answers. But we do have parochial economic interests in protecting local military bases - NAS Corpus Christi, the Army Depot, Naval Station Ingleside and NAS Kingsville - and we would urge Congress to go slow and to consider Cohen's plan most carefully before starting a new base-closure process. At the local level, the South Texas Military Facilities Task Force, undoubtedly the best of its kind in the country, must be prepared.

Minneapolis Star Tribune April 8, 1998

Base closings

Save money, strengthen defense

Two things Americans should be able to count on from a conservative Republican Congress: tightfisted spending and support for a strong national defense. True, the high cost of modern

weaponry can put those two policies in conflict. But all the more reason to think that this Congress would embrace a plan to enhance military strength while saving billions of dollars. Especially if its chief proponent is a respected former Republican senator like Secretary of Defense William Cohen.

Cohen wants to launch another round of military base closings, which, he keeps reminding Congress, haven't kept pace with budget cutbacks and shrinkage in military personnel levels. The result is that the armed forces must expend proportionally more of their reduced numbers of people and dollars on base maintenance, leaving even less for operations.

It's a message, however, to which Congress has mostly turned a deaf ear. Oh, Cohen did open some minds when he released a report last week showing that earlier rounds of base closings are saving more money than previously estimated. According to the report, the base-closure process has reached the break-even point this year, with cumulative savings now matching the initial relocation and other costs. By 2001, the report says, total net savings should reach \$14 billion, with annual savings of \$5.6 billion expected from then on. An audit has found that savings from 1993 closings have so far been 29 percent greater than the Defense

Department had estimated.

But most in Congress remain opposed to more closings, insisting that the time isn't right -- especially not in an election year. Defense officials say, however, that they can't wait much longer for a new closure plan. With departmental budgets already being programmed for the years 2000 to 2005, they say they need to know what savings the services can expect from further base closings so they can decide how best to spend that money on weapons, training and operations.

No one would argue that military bases can be closed without cost -- whether economic or political. But neither should military spending be used as a kind of civilian jobs program -- with the money being spread around not on the basis of defense needs but of local economic benefit.

Politics will inevitably have a say in where defense money goes and how much gets spent for which military purposes. But the armed services should not be forced indefinitely to maintain bases that they not only can't use efficiently but whose continued existence drains scarce resources from the Defense Department's real purpose -- protecting the country from foreign threats.

Fort Lauderdale (FL) Sun-Sentinel

April 7, 1998

Pg. 18

Congress Can Try To Avoid Blame, But Military Bases Must Be Closed

Mayor Ned Randolph of Alexandria, La., offered some valuable insight this week into the closing of military facilities. Far from damaging the economy of his city, he said, Alexandria has been able to adapt quite nicely to the demise of England Air Force Base.

In its place, the city established an industrial park, where 1,500 civilians now are employed, double the number of civilians who worked at the base.

"There is life after base closure," he said. "Where there was doom and gloom, there came hope."

Randolph joined Defense Secretary William Cohen at the Pentagon last week in making a pitch to close more military bases. Adm. Jay Johnson, the Navy's top officer, joined the chorus.

Johnson said that unless money is saved by shutting down unneeded facilities, with freed resources channeled into new equipment and training, the military's war-fighting capacity would suffer.

Unfortunately, Congress has been turning a deaf ear to the Pentagon's demands that military funds be spent on things other than making certain congressman are re-elected.

After a series of base closings that took place earlier in the decade, members of Congress are gun-shy. They don't want to take the heat from constituents by ordering closures that might damage a community's economy.

As Randolph noted, however, the damage can be short-term. America's leaders in previous generations recognized this. The nation geared up to fight a war, and when it was over, demobi-

lized as quickly as possible in order to get back to more lucrative civilian production.

With the end of World War II, and the beginning of the Cold War, that changed. The Soviet threat necessitated that vast resources be spent on the military, and the military-industrial-congressional complex was happy to oblige.

Since the end of the Cold War, military spending has fallen from about 6 percent of the nation's total economic output to about 3 percent. During that same time frame, the national economy has boomed.

The good times can't be attributed solely to a cut in military spending, but a shift of resources into civilian production can't be discounted as a contributing factor to the economic expansion, either.

Cohen has said the military can act on its own simply by neglecting facilities, and eventually mothballing them. That's a dangerous tactic. Angry congressman can respond in all sorts of hostile ways, including cutting funding for things the military wants and needs.

The mature way for Congress to proceed is to empower a commission to recommend base closings, and then vote up or down for all the recommendations.

This tactic was used previously, and provided members of Congress with the political cover they needed to make tough decisions on base closings.

The alternative of Congress maintaining the status quo is unacceptable. The U.S. military is deployed throughout the world, and its resources are stretched thin.

If soldiers die in Bosnia, Iraq, Korea or other trouble spots for lack of training, equipment or spare parts, members of Congress will have blood on their hands for putting their political futures ahead of the lives of America's fighting men and women.

More bang for the buck

Closing bases will help the military afford new weapons

Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen is calling on Congress to approve more military base closings -- an idea that legislators rejected just last year. They should heed his call this time. Base closings won't weaken the military but make it stronger.

Mr. Cohen persuasively argues that the money freed up by closing redundant bases could pay for weapons systems that the

armed forces need to be effective. Despite four previous rounds of base closings, surplus capacity in the armed forces is far from being solved. Since the end of the Cold War, U.S. forces have shrunk by 36 percent but the military infrastructure has been reduced by only 21 percent.

It does get down to a choice between idle piers and more sub-

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
April 7, 1998

marines, underutilized airbases and more planes. As Admiral J.L. Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations, said in appearing jointly with Mr. Cohen at the Pentagon last week, "If we don't shed structure, our war-fighting capability will suffer."

The Department of Defense estimates that previous base closings will save about \$25 billion by the year 2003. Two more rounds of base closings will save an estimated \$20 billion between 2008 and 2015 and \$3 billion each year thereafter.

That money could be put to much more effective use. Mr. Cohen underscored this point by spelling out what \$20 billion would mean to each of the branches of the armed services.

For example, it would buy the Air Force 450 Joint Strike Fighters, or the Navy two new aircraft carriers and 12 surface combatant ships, or the Army 650 Comanche helicopters and 800 Crusader advanced artillery systems, or the Marines 1,000 advanced amphibious assault vehicles and 250 Joint Strike Fighters.

Military savings were once justified in terms of a "peace dividend," but the dividend to be paid here would come in the event of war and would be measured in terms of objectives met and American lives saved. Members of Congress who believe that the military has been cut too much should not oppose trimming the fat from military bases when doing so will boost military muscle.

Actually, it is politics, not a wise management of resources, that may loom large in Congress. In the base realignment and closure (BRAC) process, politicians are insulated from decisions that may be potentially harmful to their electorates. An independent commission has hearings and Congress votes on a list of rec-

ommendations for base closings, which it must accept or reject, not individually, but in total.

Nevertheless, after four rounds of this, the choices are fewer and certain vulnerable bases are more clearly identified by representatives with an eye to protecting hometown interests. (Although, as Mr. Cohen made clear, some areas that have lost their bases have found themselves revitalized after the initial pain.)

President Clinton also soured enthusiasm for the process when he tried to soften the blow of base closings in vote-rich California and Texas by moving to privatize aircraft maintenance operations at the sites before the 1996 presidential elections. But residual resentment over this maneuver should not lead to the abandonment of a process that has served the nation well.

The alternatives are worse. Mr. Cohen warned that he might have to let some bases simply deteriorate, or put them in mothballs, so that he could redirect resources where they are needed. That drastic suggestion is unrealistic, as the secretary tacitly acknowledged, but it is a measure of his frustration and the seriousness of the situation.

Choices must be made. What the military is going through is the equivalent of the necessary process that has made American industry much more productive in recent years. As events in Iraq recently reminded us, the military needs to remain strong -- and it can't if military dollars are squandered. If Congress reinstitutes the BRAC process, our armed forces can get more of the tools it needs for the job.

Military leaders have dilemma: Keep bases, but lose weapons

WASHINGTON

All around the country, bulldozers and cranes are stirring up the dust where military trucks used to go.

Here, a Pentagon commissary called Cameron Station that sprawled over acres of valuable real estate in Virginia has been pulled down and is giving way to one of the area's most prosperous residential complexes.

Charleston, S.C., which moaned a few years ago over the loss of 6,272 civilian jobs at its naval base, is now employing 8,500 as employers like Charleston Marine Manufacturing and the Postal Service have moved in to occupy the space. Fort Devens, Mass., lost 2,178 civilian jobs, but created 3,000 to replace them with a Gillette plant, a prison medical facility and other employers.

The Pentagon has a whole list of these success stories it wants to share with us. Some of them are in dispute: Commercial losses from soldiers and sailors don't always figure in calculations, and most success stories seem to be in urban areas.

Nonetheless, the wasteland that base closing foes conjured up when the Cold War ended hasn't come to pass. They wailed that grass would grow up through the cracks of streets in military and naval ghost towns. And when 70 military installations were shut down from 1989 to 1993, it seemed that's where a lot of communities were headed.

But Defense Secretary William Cohen is now making a solid case for more realignment.

Since last year, that process has been snagged by petty regional bickering. The charge is that President Clinton — in order to help himself in the 1996 election — threw a lot of Air Force depot and maintenance work to California and Texas at the expense of Oklahoma, Utah and Georgia. The so-called "depot caucus" is so angry at Clinton's politicizing of base closings that they have stopped the base closing and realignment in its tracks.

It's petty stuff, and Cohen is at the moment trying to pull off the impossible — to convince Congress in an election year to authorize two final rounds of closings and cutbacks. Backed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he contends that military installations remain 23 percent in excess of needs.

The military services and their allies in Congress have never been

ones to worry about a little excess capacity here and there. But the balanced budget requirements Congress and the White House embraced have presented them with a dilemma: they can go on carrying this surplus, but if they do, it will be a lot tougher to pry loose funds for the things they really want — newer weapons in the next century, and training to keep fewer troops at higher readiness.

Unless Congress authorizes the base shutdowns and cutbacks, "we will not be able to achieve modernization goals or prevent erosion of readiness," Cohen said.

Cohen is advancing the notion that new strike aircraft such as the F-22 fighter and additional production of advanced warplanes such as the F-18 will be in jeopardy unless Congress can free some "savings" from base closures.

There is a problem with this line of reasoning. It abandons a national security canon — that defense spending ought to be based on need, not what would be nice to have.

Sadly, Cohen says, "it is no longer clear that they give you the money if you need it." The Pentagon, like every agency, is forced to compete against domestic spending departments for shares of the pie. That is a struggle in peacetime. The world presents lots of potential menace, but not as much clear and present danger as it used to.

The best thing Cohen has going now is that closing a base can be beneficial in a time of general pros-

Richmond Times-
Dispatch
April 9, 1998
Pg. 8

**JOHN
HALL**

perity. The sooner the Pentagon can make the alternatives palatable to communities, the easier it will be to get the depot caucus off its back.

John Hall's e-mail address is:
jhall@media-general.com

Vietnam to survey impact of U.S. chemical use in war

HANOI, Vietnam — Prime Minister Phan Van Khai has ordered the first national survey of people affected by toxic chemicals used by U.S. forces in the Vietnam War.

In 1994, the government estimated that 2 million people were suffering from problems related to

the chemicals. The survey, to be completed next year, will assess the number affected, their living and health conditions, their ability to work and their employment status.

Results would be used to work out long-term solutions to deal with the health problems associated with defoliants such as Agent Orange and other chemicals, the *Nhan Dan* newspaper reported.

Yes, there's life after base closing

■ **Recovery:** *Panic assailed Charleston, S.C., when the government decided to shut its Navy base and shipyard. But regional cooperation has brought new business and industry, jobs and revenue.*

By PAUL WEST
SUN NATIONAL STAFF

CHARLESTON, S.C. — How many Charlestonians does it take to change a light bulb? Answer: Two dozen. One to replace the bulb, and 23 to talk about how great the old bulb was.

That joke pretty much sums up the way change is viewed in this 300-year-old port city, which places a high premium on preserving its past. And it helps explain the uproar here when word came from Washington, five years ago, that Charleston might be about to lose its Navy base — the third-largest home port in the country.

"It wasn't just the prospect of losing the jobs," recalls Charleston Mayor Joseph P. Riley Jr. "It was the great affection that this community had for the Navy."

The mayor, among the gloomiest of the doomsayers back then, understates matters when he describes "great concern" that was felt locally after the Base Realignment and Closure Commission voted in June 1993 to shutter the Charleston naval complex. As a Harvard University study later put it: "Pandemonium set in."

Sensing an impending economic catastrophe, panicked city leaders mounted a million-dollar lobbying push to keep the base open. It was the fiercest resistance to the federal government in these parts since the opening shots of the Civil War were fired across Charleston Harbor, and, ultimately, as unsuccessful.

Today, as Defense Secretary William S. Cohen is proposing two more rounds of base closures, he is citing Charleston as a guiding example, not of resistance, but of the blessings that can come from military downsizing.

"To be honest," says Ben Cole, president of the 3-year-old Charleston Regional Development Alliance, "a lot of people around here would say the closing of the base was the best thing that ever happened."

In a visit last week, Vice President Al Gore hailed Charleston as a "success story" for showing the nation how "to turn the defense bases that won the Cold War into magnets for jobs and the success stories of the future."

Arthur Ravenel Jr., a former congressman who played a key role in converting the base into an industrial park, says that "instead of things going to hell, we're experiencing a boom. Base closure has worked out well for us."

It certainly didn't look that way a few years back.

Of all the cities picked in the 1993 round of base closures, Charleston was the hardest hit. The naval station and shipyard had once been the largest employer in the state and was still the biggest in the Charleston area.

Though employment at the "gravy yard" had been declining for years, Charleston still depended on the federal government for one-third of its economy. A total of 22,000 jobs would be lost when the base closed, a major part of the work force in a region of 525,000 people.

As is frequently the case with military downsizing, most predictions of calamity were far off-base. The Chamber of Commerce warned that joblessness might reach 20 percent. It barely rose at all, and today it is about 3 percent, well below the national average.

In part, Charleston exported its job losses. When the Navy shipped out for good two years ago, many workers from the base retired or moved away. By some estimates, the area lost almost 50,000 people.

While the shutdown cost Charleston many skilled workers, it provided benefits for area businesses, which had struggled to compete with the higher wages paid by the federal government. South Carolina has one of the least unionized work forces, a major selling point for recruiters who have made the state a magnet for foreign investment.

Until the base closed, Charleston had been largely left out of those recruitment efforts. Out of necessity, the private-public Regional Development Alliance was formed in 1995 to do something Charleston had never really tried: aggressively seek out companies to move to the area.

The result was that about 65 new businesses, representing \$1.7 billion in private investment and 7,100 jobs, have located in the area. They include a new steel mini-mill, expansion of a chemical plant and several phone reservation centers.

"What Charleston learned is that you don't focus on the base. The issue is how do you make things better when you have a major economic loss," says Edward Robbins of Harvard's urban design school.

Helped by a national economic boom, Charleston's resurgence owes much to an expanding tourist trade and its busy port.

The key, officials say, was the willingness of local politicians to put aside jealousies and turf battles and pitch in together.

"It's really a good model of what can be done under the umbrella of regionalism," says Cole, chairman of the Regional Development Alliance.

Spread along 1,514 acres on the banks of the Cooper River, a few miles upstream from downtown Charleston, the old shipyard does-

n't bustle as it once did. Many buildings remain unoccupied. Others must be stripped of asbestos or demolished, and there is a toxic waste dump that may have been paved over. Millions of dollars will be needed to upgrade the sewer system and maintain roads.

"The dirty secret of the base-closure process is that these places are not crown jewels in any way, shape or form," says Erik Pages of Business Executives for National Security, which advocates closing bases.

The dry docks are now in the hands of private owners. An old instructional building is a magnet high school. Shipyard workers are converting Navy ships into floating electric-power generation plants for Third World countries, and warehouses are alive with activity. Along the waterfront can be found everything from a yacht builder to an entrepreneur shipping frozen chickens to Russia.

By focusing on keeping the property "warm," offering low-cost leases and other incentives to private companies, the former Navy base now employs 3,725 people.

Half of these jobs are with federal agencies that moved to

Charleston. They include a Border Patrol training center, a Defense Department accounting center, a regional headquarters of AmeriCorps and a Coast Guard base.

There are plans for converting the old base golf course into a conference center and retirement community. Futrex Inc., which hopes to build low-cost urban monorail systems, would establish its plant at the former base.

"We've got a long way to go, but it's definitely a success so far," says Jack Sprott, executive director of the Charleston Naval Complex Redevelopment Authority, in an interview at his office in the historic old base hospital.

Once-pessimistic local officials seem convinced that their communities have turned the corner.

"In 10 years, people will say, the naval what? Ten years from now, according to the plan, you'll see some nice houses, you'll see some maritime-related activities, you'll see parks with access to the river," says Mayor R. Keith Summey of North Charleston, where the base is located.

His Charleston counterpart, Mayor Riley, says, "The lessons are

here that a community can recover. There is life after base closure. But you've got to work your heart out. And you need good cooperation from the national government."

Besides a more vibrant and diversified local economy, there is intangible benefit in having come through this process, he adds.

"I think there exists in the community," says the mayor, after a pause, "a greater confidence about our ability to successfully handle change than we might have had before."

Wall Street Journal

April 9, 1998 Pg. 1

Latvia's government was thrown into crisis when one of six parties in the ruling coalition walked out, accusing the nationalist premier of hurting ties with Russia. Moscow is weighing sanctions, including diverting oil from the former Soviet state, over hostile acts toward Russian nationals.

* * *

Hearings on the IMF are planned by a House subcommittee chairman who opposes Clinton's request for \$18 billion to help combat the Asian crisis. Rep. Spencer Bachus, R., Ala., says they will focus on the agency's overall mission and procedures.

Jane's Defence Weekly

April 8, 1998

Invertebrates: a new form of CB agent detection?

Barbara Starr,
Washington DC

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has initiated research to determine if species of insects, fish or a wide range of invertebrates can be used to monitor the environment for the presence of chemical-biological (CB) warfare agents.

The programme, referred to as "controlled biological systems", will attempt to "use existing species moving about to collect information in the environment", said project manager Alan Rudolph.

DARPA is interested in using groups of species that move in swarms or schools to collect environmental signature information. As well as CB warfare data, DARPA is interested in using the groups to potentially collect signature information on unexploded ordnance. Other applications could include collecting infrared and signature data. The work will focus only

on defensive detection requirements, Rudolph stressed.

DARPA scientists believe that if they could better understand how invertebrates sense the environment for foraging, identifying mates and avoiding predators, they could use that information to have them function as remote sensors collecting information for warfighters.

One theory being explored, for example, is that micro-sensors could be attached to a bee-hive or to the bees themselves to monitor exposure to threats in their environment. Bees are a viable option for the programme because they range over wide areas. Similarly, sensors could be attached to fish to monitor toxic exposures as they travel long distances in rivers or other bodies of water.

Although the DARPA project may be somewhat innovative in the specialised warfighting environment, similar work has been going on for some years in the biological and environmental communities, Rudolph said. Companies involved in biological and agricultural research, as well as those working in more traditional defence systems integration, are interested in the new

programme, he said.

He also stressed that DARPA will limit its work to invertebrates and is likely to focus on bees, beetles and fish. Animals such as dogs, cats and dolphins will not be used.

However, DARPA has been trying to reverse-engineer the sensitive cells in a dog's nose to replicate it in a mechanical sensor.

Scientists believe that a dog's nose is the optimum biological system for detecting CB or explosive elements. However, dogs can only work for

short periods and there is strong opposition in the USA to using dogs for defence research.

The programme will also look at how to reverse-engineer the way in which some invertebrates detect signatures in the environment in the hope of building a similar mechanical sensor, Rudolph said. He added that some beetles, for example, detect infrared or hot areas on tree bark. Similarly, some species of snakes detect their prey by infrared signature.

Jane's Defence Weekly DoD briefs NATO on result of classified cyber attack study

April 8, 1998

France, the Netherlands and the UK by Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre in mid-March to stress the growing magnitude of the threat as seen by the world's most computer-reliant society.

Hamre was joined by Art Money, assistant secretary of the air force for research, development and acquisition. Money is soon expected to be named as assistant secretary of defense overseeing information operations.

While US officials are confident their European counterparts are aware of the vulner-

The Pentagon has given key NATO allies access to some of the results of a highly classified US exercise that raised serious questions about how to fend off and respond to attacks on computer networks and other information systems.

The alarming results of 'Eligible Receiver', a cyber wargame organised by the joint chiefs of staff last year, were briefed to Germany, Belgium,

abilities inherent in the information age, they wanted to stress that efforts must get under way now to protect what is fast becoming the world's new way of life, in which the Internet and other computer-based activities continue to transcend borders.

Although Hamre could not discuss the classified results in detail, he said they "show that there are significant challenges and vulnerabilities". He also said he is working on declassifying parts of the findings so that more officials can better grasp what societies may be dealing with. According to a

Pentagon official familiar with the results of 'Eligible Receiver', one of the most disconcerting findings was that the US national security apparatus is ill-prepared to deal with a large-scale computer attack, particularly in designating a government agency to take the lead.

Partly due to what was learned from 'Eligible Receiver', as well as a recent attack on unclassified Pentagon computers which Hamre described as the "most organized and systematic" yet, the Pentagon has stepped up efforts to deal with the problem.

Defense Daily

April 9, 1998

Pg. 1

SAFETY RECORD LEADS AIR FORCE TO RELIEVE WING COMMANDER

By Greg Caires

The Air Force on Monday abruptly relieved the commander of the 388th Fighter Wing (FW), Hill AFB, Utah, following three mishaps involving Lockheed Martin [LMT] fighters in as many months.

Col. Ronald Fly "was relieved of command by 12th Air Force commander Lt. Gen. Landsford Trapp," a spokesman for the 388th told *Defense Daily* yesterday.

Relieving a wing commander over safety concerns is not unprecedented, although there is no policy for determining whether a unit commander should be relieved following one or more mishaps, officials said. "Ultimately, the unit commander is responsible for the unit's safety. And if the commander no longer has the confidence of his superiors, then he will probably be relieved," one service official added.

Fly decided to retire from the Air Force after being relieved, officials said.

"The recent safety record of the 388th Fighter Wing was the primary factor in Col. Fly's decision to retire," according to a statement provided by the 388th public affairs office. In addition, Fly's "decision to retire from active-duty service was his own."

Fly, a 1974 Air Force Academy graduate, is an experienced pilot with more than 2,700 hours logged in F-4, F-5, F-16 and AT-38 jets.

Col. Mike Hostage has assumed command of the 388th. Previously, Hostage was the assistant director of operations at the Air Force's Air Combat Command, Langley AFB, Va.

At press time, Trapp and Hostage were unavailable for comment, while Fly declined to be interviewed.

Since his dismissal from the 388th, Fly has been reassigned to the Ogden Air Logistics Center, also at Hill, officials said. Pending his discharge, Fly will serve as special assistant to Ogden's commander Maj. Gen. Richard Roellig, although it is unclear what Fly's duties will be. "This is a huge depot with no end to the things he could be doing," Ogden ALC spokesman Bruce Collins told *Defense Daily* yesterday. When pressed, Collins said that Fly would probably take on "projects and other action items" that Roellig needs done.

Ogden ALC is one of three Air Force depots that survived the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. Its work content includes F-16 depot maintenance and is the home for the Peacekeeper and Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile simulators.

Since early 1998, three separate Class A mishaps--accidents where an aircraft is either destroyed or suffers over \$1 million in damage--occurred on Fly's watch as the 388th's commander.

The first mishap occurred Jan. 7 when two F-16s from the 388th collided over the Utah Test and Training Range. One pilot was forced to eject but the other managed to land safely. Neither pilot was injured during the accident.

A second mishap occurred the following day when a 388th pilot ejected from his F-16 after experiencing "some form of engine failure" while practicing low-level bombing maneuvers, according to the unit's statement. The pilot suffered minor injuries.

The latest mishap occurred March 24 when an F-16 veered off of Hill's runway while landing. The pilot sustained minor injuries after ejecting in windy conditions, the 388th statement adds.

Three separate Accident Investigation Boards (AIB) are still reviewing the mishaps, the causes of which have not yet been disclosed. As the AIB process usually takes 90 days from the time of the accident, the first mishap's report is shortly expected to be released.

Since entering Air Force service in 1976, 233 F-16s have been involved in Class A mishaps. In FY '97, 11 F-16s were destroyed resulting in four fatalities. Five of those mishaps were found to have been related to problems with the fighter's engine, which is supplied by both Pratt & Whitney [UTX] and General Electric [GE].

The Air Force projects that 11 F-16s will be involved in Class A mishaps during FY '98. To date, six F-16s--including the four at Hill--have been involved in Class As. One mishap that occurred last month within hours of the third Hill accident killed an F-16 pilot stationed in Korea (*Defense Daily*, March 26).

Richmond Times-Dispatch
April 9, 1998
Pg. 4

Iran frees 5,584 POWs, including Iraqi generals

BAGHDAD, Iraq — Iran has released 5,584 Iraqi POW's in the last week, including high ranking army generals, in the largest prisoner swap between the two ene-

mies since 1990, the Red Cross said yesterday.

The series of POW exchanges took place under ICRC supervision at the al-Mundariya border checkpoint, 100 miles northeast of Baghdad.

In the final swap Monday eve-

ning, Iraq freed a pilot who was captured after his plane was shot down at the start of the 1980-1988 war.

Iraq also released some 316 "civil detainees" seized during unrest in southern Iraq following the end of the 1991 Gulf War.

An Apology Is Not Enough

What will happen in the next case of genocide?

Washington Post

April 9, 1998

Pg. 25

By Yael S. Aronoff

President Clinton's apology for the lack of U.S. action during the Rwandan genocide is a welcome first step toward the prevention of future genocides. Absent from his apology, however, are specific statements about what he and his administration ought to have done differently at the time -- beyond the vague "we should have done more" -- and what they would do once genocide already is underway in the future.

Absent these specifics, the apology constituted a genuine empathy with the suffering of others, but it does not do enough to ensure that future genocides will be prevented or ended. Once genocide is underway, it is unlikely that anything but military force will end the horror. The main question the president needs to address is, "Do you support military action by U.N. forces, and by U.S. forces when the United Nations is not acting quickly enough to stop genocide already underway?"

In his recent speech to the Rwandans, President Clinton highlighted three claims: first, that he did not fully appreciate the depth and speed of the genocide; second, that the administration should have called the killings a genocide earlier; third, that the United States should have acted more quickly to stop the genocide and not

have allowed the refugee camps to become safe havens for the perpetrators.

While working in the secretary of defense's Office of Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs, I participated in the Department of Defense Rwanda Task Force. I had the stomach-turning task of sending daily body counts to my bosses by 8 every morning, and thus can attest to the fact that the intelligence was there for anyone in the administration to see. It is a positive step for the president to say that they should have, early on, called the murders by their rightful name -- genocide. But had the proper term been used, what course of action would the president have been willing to take?

Even after the administration did begin using the term genocide, very little action was taken. Likewise, it is a positive suggestion to have the administration and the international community improve its system for identifying nations in danger of genocidal violence but, as is clear here, information was and is not the main problem. It is the political will to act on that information that is lacking.

I witnessed this lack of will. Despite lobbying by myself and others, even suggestions to interfere with the radio broadcasts inciting the killing were discouraged by some in the Defense Department, let alone

speeding up equipment for U.N. volunteers or sending U.S. soldiers to put a stop to the massacres. There seemed to be an understanding at the time among practically all members of the administration and in the various bureaucracies that, after the deaths of U.S. soldiers in Somalia, Clinton would not be willing to risk any American lives in Africa.

When the United States finally did choose humanitarian intervention for Rwandan refugees in Zaire, after the genocide had ended, administration spokesmen stressed the differences between Somalia and Rwanda. The difference was precisely that which would have prevented the halting of genocide in the first place; American soldiers, it was argued, would be at virtually no risk in providing water to refugees, as opposed to preventing Tutsis from being hacked to death. Because there was no predetermined foreign policy goal of halting genocide when feasible, and because there was a lack of political will to do so, it is likely that military intervention to stop the genocide may never even have been discussed. I do not think that there was a Principals' Meeting on Rwanda during the entire 2 1/2 months in which the genocide was taking place.

This same unwillingness to engage in military action applied to the refugee camps following the genocide. The only way to have prevented the

refugee camps from becoming safe havens for the 30,000 former soldiers and militiamen responsible for the genocide was to support U.N. or U.S. action in physically disarming these killers. Thus, when Clinton says that "we should have prevented the refugee camps from becoming safe havens for killers," is he saying that he should have supported U.N. military action and even ordered U.S. troops to participate in disarming genocidal killers? More important, is he saying that he would be willing to do so in the future?

Clinton should elaborate on his apology so that it can truly be a basis for different policy in the future. He should strongly support a standing U.N. force, and in the meantime state his readiness to use our own forces to halt genocide when the risk is proportionally low and the probability of success high, as it was in Rwanda. Without such concrete statements, his apology is reduced to, "We should have done more, but we don't know exactly what." The United States, as the world's leading power, should lead the world into the 21st century having learned to put an end to the most barbaric and brutal acts of the 20th century.

The writer was assistant for regional humanitarian affairs in the Pentagon's Office of Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs.

Serbs want Albanians driven from Serbia

Washington Times
April 7, 1998 Pg. 13

BELGRADE — More than 40 percent of Serbs believe the Kosovo crisis can only be resolved by making the ethnic Albanian majority leave the province in southern Serbia, according to an opinion poll published yesterday.

Some 42 percent of those polled said they wanted to see the

"forced" or "peaceful" expulsion of the Albanians, according to the survey published in the independent daily Nasa Borba.

Around 27 percent of Serbs questioned in the poll believe the solution is to grant "cultural autonomy" to Kosovo, while 3.3 percent favor granting the province a "republic status" equal to that of Serbia and Montenegro, the two partners in the rump Yugoslavia.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)